DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 448 672 HE 033 683

TITLE	Validating Standardized Testing: The Role of the SAT and ACT in Undergraduate Admissions. [Hearing before the California Legislature, Senate Select Committee on Higher Education Admissions and Outreach, Sacramento, California, February 5, 1998].
INSTITUTION	California State Legislature, Sacramento. Senate Select Committee on Higher Education Admissions and Outreach.
PUB DATE	1998-02-05
NOTE	171p.; Select Committee chair, Senator Teresa P. Hughes. For the supporting document containing background information for the hearing, see HE 033 682.
AVAILABLE FROM	Senate Publications, 1020 N Street, Room B-53, Sacramento, CA 95814 ($5.25 plus current California sales tax, publication number 955-S). Tel: 916-327-2155.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Admission (School); College Applicants; *College Entrance Examinations; High School Students; High Schools; Legislators; Public Colleges; *Standardized Tests; State Legislation; *Test Use
IDENTIFIERS	*ACT Assessment; California; California State University; *Scholastic Assessment Tests; University of California

ABSTRACT

This report contains testimony and materials presented at the California Senate Select Committee on Higher Education Admissions and Outreach hearing, February 1998, held to examine the role of the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT) and the American College Test (ACT) in undergraduate admissions to the public universities of California. In her opening statement, Chair Teresa P. Hughes introduced the hearing topics as determining the impact of standardized tests on students, families, and universities, and ascertaining whether standardized tests increase access or become a barrier to college enrollment. The following discussion panels and statements followed: (1) "Eligibility and Standardized Testing: The Use of Standardized Testing in Determining Student Eligibility" (Warren Fox); (2) "Standardized Assessments Up-Close: Research Supporting Validity of Tests" (participants: Wayne Camara, Laurice Sommers, and Dallas Chapman); (3) "Students and Parent Response to Standardized Tests: Personal Accounts of the Impact of SAT and ACT" (Karen Gau, Benigno Delgado, Carlos Jackson, Mary Kay Stamets, and Paul Kanarek); (4) "Standardized Tests as a Selection Tool: System Representatives Discuss the Use of Standardized Exams" (University of California representatives Carla Ferri, Keith Widaman, and Patrick Hayashi; independent college representatives William Tingley and Michael Besseda; California State University representatives Allison Jones and Nancy Sprotte); (5) "Alternative Strategies to Student Assessment: Other Forms of Standardized Assessments Employed and Available" (Eugene E. Garcia, Glen Singleton, and Andrea Buechel); (6) "Research on Standardized Tests" (Robert Schaeffer, David Leonard, Michael Hout, and Joe Jaramillo); (7) "Standardized Tests and California Public High Schools: How Are High Schools Preparing Students To Take the Exam?" (Jeffrey David, Thomas Brock, Diane Duncan, and Robert Collins); and (8) "Closing Remarks" (Teresa P. Hughes). (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 448 672

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION ADMISSIONS AND OUTREACH

CHAIRWOMAN

SENATOR TERESA P. HUGHES

VALIDATING STANDARDIZED TESTING: THE ROLE OF THE SAT AND ACT IN UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. McKean

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Thursday, February 5, 1998
11:30 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.
Room 4203, State Capitol

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 033-693

C A L I F O R N I A L E G I S L A T U R E

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION ADMISSIONS AND OUTREACH

CHAIRWOMAN

SENATOR TERESA P. HUGHES

MEMBERS

SENATOR DEDE ALPERT
SENATOR JOHN BURTON
SENATOR K. MAURICE JOHANNESSEN
SENATOR BRUCE McPHERSON
SENATOR STEVE PEACE
SENATOR RICHARD POLANCO

VALIDATING STANDARDIZED TESTING: THE ROLE OF THE SAT AND ACT IN UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS

Thursday, February 5, 1998
11:30 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.
Room 4203, State Capitol

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL .....

LIST OF WITNESSES .....

TRANSCRIPT OF TESTIMONY .....

I.	Opening Statement	1
II.	Eligibility and Standardized Testing	3
III.	Standardized Assessments Up-Close	19
IV.	Students and Parent Response to Standardized Tests	44
V.	Alternative Strategies to Student Assessment	70
VI.	Standardized Tests as a Selection Tool	88
VII.	Research on Standardized Tests	138
VIII.	Standardized Tests and California Public High Schools	122
IV.	Closing Remarks	162

MEMBERS
DEDE ALPERT
JOHN BURTON
F. MAURICE JOHANNESSEN
BRUCE McPHERSON
STEVE PEACE
RICHARD POLANCO

California Legislature

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION ADMISSIONS AND OUTREACH

TERESA P. HUGHES
CHAIRWOMAN

JAMILLAH MOORE
CONSULTANT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING
1020 N STREET, ROOM 523
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
916 322 4400
916 445 2104

July 13, 1998

Honorable John Burton
President Pro Tempore of the Senate
Office of the President Pro Tempore
Room 205, State Capitol
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator Burton:

The attached publication represents testimony and materials presented at the Senate Select Committee on Higher Education Admissions and Outreach hearing held on February 5, 1998.

This hearing examined the role of the SAT and ACT in Undergraduate Admissions.

Witnesses at the hearing made a number of recommendations regarding the purpose and use of standardized tests in college admissions.

I am confident the Legislature will find this information useful as it formulates the goals of the Senate Select Committee on Higher Education Admissions and Outreach.
If you are interested in additional copies, please contact Senate Publications at (916) 327-2155.

Sincerely,

Teresa P. Hughes

TERESA P. HUGHES
Chairwoman

TPH:jm

MEMBERS
DEDE ALPERT
JOHN BURTON
F. MAURICE JOHANNESSEN
BRUCE MCPHERSON
STEVE PEACE
RICHARD POLANCO

California Legislature

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE
ON
HIGHER EDUCATION ADMISSIONS
AND OUTREACH

TERESA P. HUGHES
CHAIRWOMAN

JAMILLAH MOORE
CONSULTANT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING
1020 N STREET, ROOM 523
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
(916) 322-4400
(916) 445-2104

VALIDATING STANDARDIZED TESTING:
The Role of the SAT and ACT in Undergraduate Admissions
February 5, 1998 (upon adjournment of floor session)
11:30 a.m. - 5:30 p.m.
Room 4203, State Capitol

OPENING STATEMENT
Senator Teresa P. Hughes, Chair

ELIGIBILITY and STANDARDIZED TESTING
The Use of Standardized Testing in Determining Student Eligibility
Warren Fox, Executive Director, California Postsecondary Education Commission

STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENTS UP-CLOSE
Research Supporting Validity of Test
Wayne Camara, Director of Research, The College Board (SAT)
Laurice Sommers, Counselor Fremont High School
Dallas Chapman, Assistant Vice President, ACT

STUDENTS AND PARENT RESPONSE TO STANDARDIZED TESTS
Personal Accounts of the impacts of SAT and ACT
Karen Gau, student, Whitney High School (perfect SAT)
Benigno Delgado, student, University of California, Santa Cruz
Carlos Jackson, student, California State University, Chico
Mary Kay Stamets, Parent, Carmichael Parent Teachers Association
Paul Kanarek, President, The Princeton Review

STANDARDIZED TESTS AS A SELECTION TOOL
System representatives discuss the use of standardized exams
The University of California
Carla Ferri, Director of Undergraduate Admissions
Keith Widaman, Chair, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools
Patrick S. Hayashi, Associate Vice Chancellor

Independent Colleges and Universities
William Tingley, Vice President, Admissions and Financial Aid, Occidental College
Michael Besseda, Assistant Vice President, Saint Mary's College
The California State University
Allison Jones, Senior Director Access and Retention
Nancy Sprotte, Coordinator of Enrollment Management Services

ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES TO STUDENT ASSESSMENT
Other forms of Standardized Assessments Employed and Available
Eugene E. Garcia Latino Eligibility Task Force
Glen Singleton, Executive Director, Pacific Educational Group
Andrea Buechel, Managing Director, Pacific Educational Group

RESEARCH ON STANDARDIZED TESTS
Robert Schaeffer, Educational Director, FAIRTEST
David Leonard, Professor of Political Science, UC Berkeley
Michael Hout, Professor of Sociology, UC Berkeley
Larger Societal and Community Ramifications
Joe Jaramillo, Staff Attorney, MALDEF

STANDARDIZED TESTS AND CALIFORNIA PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS
How are High Schools Preparing Students to take the exam
Jeffrey Davis, Principal, Coronado High School
Thomas Brock, Principal, Gretchen Whitney High School
Diane Duncan, Counselor, Woodland High School
Robert Collins, Director of Instruction, Los Angeles Unified School District

CLOSING REMARKS:
Senator Teresa P. Hughes

SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION ADMISSIONS OUTREACH

Senator Teresa P. Hughes, Chair

The Role of the SAT and ACT in Undergraduate Admissions

February 5, 1998
State Capitol

SENATOR TERESA HUGHES, CHAIR: The Senate Select Committee on Higher Education Admissions and Outreach will now commence.

I'm happy to be joined by Senator McPherson and Assemblywoman Havice, and other members will be coming in and out during the course of the day. We have a big, fat agenda. We have a lot of work to do. I appreciate you all being here in this inclement weather, but we're going to see that the sun shines in the future by the work that we do today. Thank you again for coming.

Over the next 10 years the number of public high school students is projected to increase by 50 percent. Today, more students are preparing themselves for college, with a larger portion of high school students enrolling in college preparatory courses. Current projections indicate that participation in postsecondary education is also expected to increase by 455,000 students by the year 2005. In our increasingly competitive economy, a college education is nearly universally agreed as the admissions ticket to a working wage and a potential social mobility.

With the tremendous increase in student population, more students preparing themselves for postsecondary education, and new college admissions criteria, standardized tests have become one of the two critical factors in determining undergraduate admissions.

California State University system's major assessment tools, along with GPA, are the SAT and ACT. Since 1926 the SAT has served as the nation's most prominent college admissions examination. The founders of the College Board and the ETS sought initially to standardize college admissions testing to overcome problems caused by colleges having different entrance requirements and examinations.

According to the College Board, each year nearly two million -- two million -- college-bound students from more than 20,000 high schools take a standardized exam for college admissions. The number of graduates taking the SAT from 1990 to 1996 was increased by 18 percent from 112,000 to 132,000. The same is true of the ACT exam, with an increase of 77 percent more students taking the exam from 17,000 to 31,000.

Currently, proposals to modify the use of the SAT and admissions policy are being considered by the University of California. Nearly 300 colleges and universities across the country have the test as an option.

As test use has increased, extensive research indicates that women and certain underrepresentative groups have consistently scored lower on these examinations. According to The Princeton Review, there is a relationship between standardized test scores and family income, with the students coming from wealthier backgrounds scoring higher than students coming from lower socioeconomic backgrounds.

We're here today for the main purpose of discussing the impact of standardized tests on students, families and universities. This hearing will

address some of the complex admissions issues that arise as public universities attempt to serve all of our state citizens.

It is also our goal to examine if standardized tests are increasing access or actually becoming a barrier to college enrollment. In addition, we will engage in a serious discussion of the merits of, and the concerns surrounding, the SAT and the ACT, their purpose, effectiveness and alternatives.

At this time I would like to welcome my colleagues for joining me and tell you that members have very huge schedules today; and with all of the changes and festivities going on, members will be back and forth. But everyone, everyone in this building, is really interested in our concerns and our agenda.

Now, our first topic will be the "Eligibility and Standardized Testing," and the use of standardized testing in determining students' eligibility. The first panel will be lead by Warren Fox, the Executive Director of CPEC, and his staff.

Good afternoon.

DR. WARREN FOX: Good afternoon. Thank you. My name is Warren Fox, Executive Director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission. With me is Jean Ludwig, our senior author and staff on the recently completed Eligibility Study.

And before we start, Senator, I want to thank you for taking your time to visit with our commission for a continued dialogue about these serious issues. And I agree with you, everybody in this building, and all of the students throughout the state who are potentially college bound, are also very interested in these issues and in the work of your group and the Legislature.

Our intent today is to talk about the use of standardized admission tests in determining eligibility to the University of California and to the State

University. I also note that you have background material from CPEC, the Postsecondary Education Commission, and the booklet that you handed out, and also the summary overview document that you provided to the participants of this meeting. Some of the issues I'll refer to probably can be found in those supplementary materials.

Eligibility studies report the number of students who are graduating from California's high schools who are eligible then for admission to the University of California or to the California State University system. Also noted in the materials you handed out, the first Eligibility Study was completed in 1955. And for purposes of this discussion, it is important to be aware of the use of standardized tests in determining student eligibility for CSU and UC.

The first sort of watershed moment that I'd like to discuss with you is the period of 1960 and 1961 -- 1960, because of the adoption of the Master Plan; and 1961, because of the Eligibility Study that was conducted by the Master Plan survey team.

All of us in California know the 1960 Master Plan for California Higher Education as it established policy guidelines for admissions to our public colleges and universities. And let me mention those guidelines. For the California community colleges, any Californian who is 18 years or older and who has the capacity and the motivation to benefit has the opportunity to enroll in a community college. Now, with respect to academic and occupational programs where there are more applicants than there are spaces in the community colleges, the current policy for admitting students to these programs at the community colleges is on a first-come-first-served basis rather than through the specifications of a particular admission criteria.

Of course, this is different at the California State University and at the University of California. Their Master Plan in 1960 encouraged the State University to select its first-time freshmen from the top one-third of public high school graduates. And for the University of California, as you well know and your committee well knows, for first time freshmen they're encouraged to select from the top one-eighth of high school graduates.

Now, the Master Plan gave the governing boards of CSU and UC the authority to set specific admission requirements, and these requirements vary between systems, and in fact, they have varied over time. But there are three components to these: One is a high school course pattern. Second is the performance of the student in those courses, or the grades and the GPA. And the third is performance on standardized college admission tests, such as the ACT and the SAT I and the SAT II. And I mentioned to you the sort of importance of the 1960-61 period because of the adoption of the Master Plan and that first Eligibility Study.

The next really critical eligibility year, sort of the second really watershed in this issue, is the Eligibility Study of 1966. In 1966, CPEC conducted this Eligibility Study, and in fact, CPEC has conducted the ones in 1975, 1983, 1986, 1990 and the one you've just recently received in 1996. But this 1966 is a very critical year, very critical for what was reported in the Eligibility Study, because by 1966, both UC and CSU had adopted standardized testing as a part of determining eligibility. Actually, in 1965 the state colleges had become what was now called the California State Colleges and University, but that year its board of trustees established an Eligibility Index that specified the combination of high school grades and college admission test scores necessary to be eligible for admission. In 1966 the University of California did the same thing. The university raised its

admissions criteria by reducing the means of achieving eligibility to two paths: (1) the completion of college preparatory curriculum with adequate grades, and (2) test scores to qualify on its Eligibility Index -- eligibility by examination alone.

To understand California's current admissions policies, one must differentiate between eligibility and admissions.

I've asked the sergeant to pass out a chart for you, which I trust is in front of you, that is entitled, "Eligibility to California's Public College." It's a one-page chart with two columns. I'd like to discuss this with you briefly about how students determine their eligibility for UC and CSU.

You'll note the course pattern is listed. You'll notice the courses in history, English, math, laboratory science, foreign language, visual and performing arts and advanced course electives. Those are the course patterns. The next line, the second criterion, is college admission tests, and the third -- the second, I'm sorry, is GPA, and then the rest refer to the college admissions test.

You will note that there are some similarity but not exact congruence between the courses required for CSU and for the University of California. For example, you'll see CSU has a course in visual and performing arts and its 15-course pattern. Then you'll notice the University of California does not. You'll also notice that the history requirement at the University of California is two courses. They recently added a World History and Geography course there. And in laboratory and science there's an additional requirement on the UC side which is not on the CSU. However, they're very similar. There are 15 courses in total. And these are the courses that students need to prepare for eligibility to either CSU or to UC.

Now, how do students do in these courses when they take this set? First of all, they need to take this entire appropriate set, and as Jean Ludwig has pointed out in our analysis -- and of course, there are students who don't take the full set and who are therefore not eligible; and as we'll see, there are many students who don't take the test who are therefore not eligible -- but how do students do in these courses? At CSU you'll notice for performance in courses that students would have a 2.0 in all of their courses in order to be eligible, and at the University of California, if they complete these courses, the University of California computes the GPA in these specific courses called the "A to F."

The next line has to do with college admission tests. If a student going to CSU has a GPA higher than 3.0, then they don't need to have a test score. At the University of California, please note though that students not only need the set of courses, they need to complete those courses with an acceptable GPA, but they also must take the ACT or SAT; and no minimum test score is needed if GPA is above 3.3, but the tests are needed. And there is an index that has been developed for CSU and to the University of California, so if you have a low GPA and you have a high index score on the test score, you can still be admitted, and that process works for both UC and CSU. They each have their own index, but the activity is the same. And you'll notice the last statement where the asterisk is for the University of California, it is possible to be admitted to the university with two test scores alone by examination only if you have superior scores.

If students in California take this appropriate pattern of courses for the California State University and have the appropriate GPA, then they are eligible for admission. If students graduated from California high schools have the UC appropriate list of courses, the A through F, and above a 2.82, or

in the case of above, 3.3 -- they need the test but no particular score -- then they are determined eligible for admission to the university. And the Master Plan guidelines call for the systems to select then from these eligible applicants who take the courses and have the GPAs that we just reviewed.

To date, the State University and the University of California have offered admission to all eligible students to their systems. However, a student's eligibility does not guarantee admission to a particular campus. Often there is confusion about a student's admission. There's a difference between eligibility and admission to your campus of choice. You might be eligible and admitted to a UC, but not to the particular campus of choice.

As this committee knows, the California Postsecondary Education Commission recently released the results of our Eligibility Study on the Class of 1996. And this study -- this is the eighth since 1955 -- surveyed over 1,360 high schools, and we found that, as the Chair mentioned, more students are taking college preparatory courses required to be eligible to the University of California and to CSU. And although more students from groups which have not traditionally enrolled in higher education are taking the right courses, these students still face many obstacles in attending the university or the State University.

The finding that Latino and Black students continue to demonstrate low college eligibility to attend our public universities is particularly troublesome. Our enrollment projections show that these student groups will comprise more than 45 percent of the public high school graduates by the year 2005.

While more students are taking required standardized admission tests, there are significant numbers of students who, if they had taken all of the required tests, would have been eligible for the University of California. And

these students fall into three categories, again, relevant to the University of California. First, the high school graduates with grade point averages of 3.3 or better in college preparatory courses who were missing all of the required college admission examinations; that is, the SAT, the SAT I and the SAT II. So these are high school graduates with a 3.3, missing all the tests. Second, the high school graduates with a grade point average of 3.3 or better in college preparatory classes who had taken either the ACT or SAT I, but who did not take the SAT II subject matter test. And third, high school graduates who have the GPA between a 2.82 and a 3.29 in these college courses who had taken the required SAT and SAT I and earned scores that would make them eligible, but they did not have one or more of the SAT II tests which are required by the University of California. So of these potentially eligible graduates, 85 percent had taken the ACT or SAT I test, but were missing one or more of the SAT II.

Our commission met on Monday, as the Senator knows, of this week to discuss the implications of our more recent Eligibility Study, and they began seeking additional information on the reasons that these students did not take the required test to achieve eligibility. As a result of our commission's study, we have jointly formed an inner segmental group to begin work on research that plans to examine the variations in college scores among students, including the admission test-taking behavior of public high school students, particularly those who were potentially eligible for the University of California. And in December, the university published its own analysis of our 1966 Eligibility Study, and I think that may be included in the workbook that's been provided at this hearing.

In closing, I'd like to discuss some ways to improve eligibility. A number of these ideas are now before the Legislature as we speak. One

possibility is to expand the pool of eligible students, and we urge you to support efforts moving through this Legislature to reach out to students to assist them in their academic preparation for college. I'm mindful, Madam Chair, that one of the charges of this committee is dealing with outreach and academic preparation of students, and there is demonstrated success for those programs to move students particularly from groups who have not had high participation rates to higher participation and eligibility rates through academic preparation programs.

The second is to increase the number of teachers. We need to increase the number of qualified teachers, particularly in science and mathematics, so that this required set of courses that we just looked at -- these required preparatory courses for college -- so that all students who want to take them can and have qualified teachers.

And third is to improve the timeliness and quality of information to students and their families, not only about academic preparation but about academic testing.

All students and their families must understand the requirements for academic courses and admission tests, including ACT, SAT, SAT I and SAT II. Students in many junior and senior high schools in the state may not have such information available to them.

Madam Chair, if I can, I want to mention an important and related issue. We're expecting increasing numbers of high school graduates. We're expecting more of these graduates to seek enrollment in postsecondary opportunities, and more students are taking the courses in order to prepare themselves. And if more students would take tests, we would have more eligible. There clearly is, as we project the possibility, that the tidal wave of students now in K-12 will impact higher education as well, and this is the

issue of space for these students if they achieve eligibility and are admitted. We need space to provide instructional facilities for increasing numbers of students. Therefore, we urge you to increase enrollment opportunities for high school graduates and address the deferred maintenance and growth needs of this state. And at some other time or place, if you choose us to talk with you, we have sound estimates that the dollar cost to provide this space for postsecondary students is $1 billion per year, each and every year, for the next 10 years: $600 million for deferred maintenance and about $400 million for growth.

We urge you to support and pass a general obligation bond, which I know is being discussed as we speak in these chambers, as the deadline is fast approaching so that that can make the June ballot. We do have a facilities crisis in K-12, and we are facing a facilities crisis in postsecondary education as well. And I wanted to take a moment to mention our work there to you and we can certainly discuss that.

I thank you for allowing us to talk about our Eligibility Study and the role of standardized tests. Jean Ludwig is here with me. And hopefully, if you have any questions, we will be able to answer them. Thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: Any questions from members?

SENATOR BRUCE MCPHERSON: Mr. Fox, with the existing campuses we have, say, in UC -- the nine -- or the 22 in CSU, how much expansion of availability do we have to add to those campuses right now without new construction? I know there can be changes in majors and that could have an impact and so forth.

DR. FOX: And the issue here is not only do we have more students, and you're working on the problem of making more of those students eligible,

and we should, and if we're successful in making more of those students eligible, then we need the space. That's your point.

At the University of California, the University of California does have some space at unimpacted campuses. But our projections are about 2005, 2006, that the University of California will have filled out its available capacity and will need additional capacity for students in the University of California. We project they'll need to take about 30,000 more students between 1993 and 2005.

For the Cal State University system, they need to enroll approximately 80,000 to 85,000 additional students over the next decade. Now, they have some new campuses coming on line. Senator McPherson, as you well know, CSU Monterey Bay will be able to take some of those students. There's an emerging off-campus center and a growing activity in Ventura. And if they build out existing campuses like San Marcos and some off-campus centers, the State University should be in good shape to 2005, 2006, if it can build out those existing appropriations to those centers that I just mentioned.

The community colleges have a very serious issue of providing space. They need to accommodate over 338,000 students. Many of those are adults coming back for training. And other impacts, such as welfare reform and other needs in the community colleges, we have a very serious issue about providing space at the community colleges.

SENATOR MCPHERSON: Is that up to 2005-6 for community colleges too?

DR. FOX: Yes, correct.

So if we are good at our work, and if this committee, and the work we're doing in the state on testing and on eligibility and on outreach and academic preparation and improved standards at high schools, if all of this works and

we have more students eligible for more racial ethnic groups, more geographic areas, we're going to have more students knocking on the door of postsecondary education, and they ought to do that. But we do have a facilities crisis facing us if we are successful, and we will be successful in getting more students to enroll.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. I'd like to acknowledge the presence of Senator Steve Peace from San Diego who has joined us for a while.

Thank you, Mr. Peace, for being here.

The UC, unlike the CSU, has a very large percentage of students that fall under the category of potentially eligible. Am I correct to assert that 9.5 percent of students with high enough GPAs, almost the entire percentage of fully eligible students, are ineligible simply because they have not taken all the test requirements? Is that true?

DR. FOX: That is correct.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. According to your statistics, 5.2 percent of the students at the UC are made ineligible due to the index, which I interpret to mean the potentially eligible students with above minimal GPA are not eligible due to lower than necessary test scores. On the other hand, CPEC states that only 3.8 percent of students are aided by the index of GPA and test scores. Thus, according to these statistics, do your numbers seem to indicate that many more students disproportionately -- underrepresentative groups -- are hurt and not helped by standardized tests? Or am I misinterpreting?

MS. JEAN LUDWIG: The 5 percent is not from the potentially eligible group but from the ineligible students. They may have their full pattern of courses, but their score on either the SAT or the ACT did place them on an index below the cutoff point. So that interpretation is correct. The proportion

who do qualify on the index is a smaller percentage of the high school graduates who must go through the index eligibility procedure.

The issue of whether more students are hurt than helped by the index is fairly complex, because without the index, the minimum GPA for UC would be at 3.3; and the opportunity then for students with GPAs lower than 3.3, currently down to 2.82, is provided through the process of taking a standardized test.

SENATOR HUGHES: So the UC, in its follow-up analysis to the CPEC study, projects that when standardized tests are not required with a minimum of 3.65 GPA will be needed to be eligible. Is that right?

Would you consider this an accurate or fair assessment given the fact that the colleges which have had optional SAT reports over ten years -- Bates & Bowen report that only 25 percent of these applicants whose test scores might not reflect their overall record elect not to submit their scores? Is that a fact?

MS. LUDWIG: The difficulty arises from the Master Plan in some ways. Those other campuses, the institutions that have done away with standardized tests, do not have the additional educational policy imperative of following the Master Plan guidelines, and so maintaining an eligible pool of 12.5 percent, as stated in the Master Plan, has been a guiding policy for the regions. And it is the inclusion of standardized tests, in connection with students' GPA and course taking, that the university has used in defining how it gets to that 12.5 percent.

SENATOR MCPHERSON: Question. You had mentioned the need for, obviously, more teachers when this increase is coming, this "tidal wave two," but how about the importance of counselors? There are very few high schools comparatively now, and how much do they need to be fitted into the--

DR. FOX: Well, they do. And there's a real need. Obviously, when we went over that list, there's the standardized test scores, that we've just been talking about, and then the students' performance in those courses. Students need to be aware, first of all, that those courses are required. They need to be counseled about starting those in an appropriate time sequence so they can finish those courses to make themselves eligible. They need to be aware of the courses, the sequence, of the GPA that's needed and also of test scores that are needed, and often this information is not made available in a timely fashion. And especially if a student could be potentially the first member of the family to go on to college, they may not be aware of this kind of information, and counselors can play an extremely important role in getting this information to students and their families.

SENATOR MCPHERSON: And that has to be done the first year of high school.

DR. FOX: Absolutely. Earlier.

SENATOR MCPHERSON: In eighth grade or that level? Is that what you'd like to see?

DR. FOX: Actually, most of us now are sort of looking at the K-18 continuum. You really need to pay attention to all of it. But by middle school, clearly, we need to have already started working with students and their families.

MS. LUDWIG: We do think that counselors are extremely important. The unfortunate part is that with the budget crisis that essentially started with Prop. 13, the counselors were very often one of the first victims of cutbacks at the schools, and so many schools are operating with counselor-to-student ratios of over 600 to 1. It's very hard to do one-on-one counseling of

the type that's needed for college preparatory work with those kinds of ratios. We very much support more counselors.

DR. FOX: And as the Chair knows, in eligibility we have some data on the number of students who did or did not take tests. When we finished the Eligibility Study, we raised almost as many questions: Why did the students not take the SAT? What was their motivation? We don't know that. We're just--

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, I would wager to guess that most students don't want to take tests unless they're made to feel as though it's a game and there's going to be an instant prize. I think students don't understand long-range prizes -- long-range prizes being the fact that you'll be able to get into the institution of your choice. So I would wager to bet that we could be more effective, don't you think, if we had more conferences, not just with students and guidance counselors but conferences with parents and guidance counselors?

DR. FOX: Absolutely.

SENATOR HUGHES: Because sometimes parents haven't even discussed with their children what they want to do or have even said to them, "If you want to go on to higher education we'll be there for you." And I think it's the communications gap that we have. And certainly as you talk about lower socioeconomic groups, where you may be the first generation to even consider going on for higher education, you have a major, major problem there.

DR. FOX: There is a proposal before this Legislature to fund an inner-segmental project called, "College: Making It Happen." It's run now for a couple of years and it can't reach all of the students in this state, but it's a cooperative effort by all the representatives of the education roundtable. And

it has video tapes and printed material in Spanish and English, and it's an excellent resource for broadcast or for school use for families and for students. And so there is currently an effort seeking some additional funding that would do just that.

SENATOR HUGHES: That would be wonderful.

SENATOR STEVE PEACE: Madam Chair.

SENATOR HUGHES: Yes, Mr. Peace.

SENATOR PEACE: On this issue, it's my observation, frankly as a parent more than anything else, that you can fund all the programs you want, increase all the number of counselors you want, but until we have that effort funded through the universities and through the state system, as opposed through the K-12 system, it isn't going to work. We need to have academic recruiters in every high school and middle school the same way we have athletic recruiters.

The kids in my district get a lot more attention as a consequence of athletic accomplishment than they do academic accomplishment. And if the university had this sort of funded outreach and active on-campus high school counseling programs funded by the universities so that that individual wakes up in the morning and knows that their success or failure is defined by identifying potentially university-eligible recruits, academic recruits, that person is going to view their job very differently than a high school counselor who, to be honest with me, even the best of efforts I have found to be generally at least a year or two years behind the curve in terms of the inflow of information, whether it's course load requirement, totally confused in terms of the differentiations between the CSU system and the UC system and requirements and very low level of motivation. Because typically, and because of the cuts in Prop. 13 and whatnot and how the schools repackage

their counseling programs for the most part, these are not full-time counselors. They're teachers that are also being given some level of counseling load.

Now, you add on to that an environment in which we no longer have a lot of the historical mentors on campus that typically came as a consequence of the sort of extracurricular activities, whether they be coaches or band directors, that sort of thing, that in the past were on-campus people who tended to be role models and sources of encouragement for kids that maybe don't have as much encouragement or direction at home, and instead we've replaced those people with folks that drop in an hour a day to do basketball practice or cheerleader squad, and they don't get to know these kids on campus on a full-time basis in terms of who they are as human beings and what their needs are and where their points of crisis may be.

Those two elements, I think, are at the heart at getting at what the sociological differentiations are between underrepresented groups and others. It's more a function of what kind of surrogate mentoring and parenting and contact these kids have so they even know there's a university option, let alone what it is they have to do to be able to pursue it.

DR. FOX: Madam Chair, as you know, the eligibility and admissions standards also change over time. So you need very timely information so that they know if, for example, you're in conversations with the University of California for potential admission by a high school if some plan comes to fruition, there will be a change. Change does occur and it's the ability to get timely information to students and their families that's important.

SENATOR HUGHES: So that students aren't two years late in getting what they need to be admitted.

DR. FOX: Exactly.

SENATOR PEACE: I would argue the only person that's going to be timely is the person whose paycheck comes from the institution, not from the high school or the elementary district or whatever.

SENATOR HUGHES: You're right.

DR. FOX: Thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Thank you very much for your testimony.

All right. Our next panel -- and I'd like for these panelists to come up -- are going to be addressing "Standardized Assessments Up-Close," research supporting validity of these tests. Wayne Camara, Director of Research, the College Board (SAT); and Laurice Sommers, counselor at Fremont High School; and Dallas Chapman, Assistant Vice President of ACT.

All right. Mr. Camara from the College Board in New York. We very much want to hear your testimony, but we don't want you to read this to us. I know this is your job, you know your job. Tell us succinctly what you say in this paper.

MR. WAYNE CAMARA: I will try to do that, Senator.

Let me begin by saying, again, my name is Wayne Camara, and I'm the Executive Director for Research and Development at the College Board. My colleague, Laurice Sommers, and I are very pleased to be testifying before this committee today.

The College Board, as you know, is a non-profit educational organization of 3,000 or more colleges, universities, secondary schools and other educational associations. And the reason we're very glad to be here is because helping students get into college does not begin in eleventh or twelfth grade. It does not begin when a student registers for an SAT, and it does not begin when a student fills out an application for the UC or the CSU system.

As previous speakers have said, and I believe others beyond me will say, admission into college, success in college, graduation from college are determined well before eleventh and twelfth grade. And it is some of those preparatory activities that I hope we can focus on, as well as tests, GPA and grades.

Addressing the educational problems that are confronting other representative minority students requires a very serious long-term and shared responsibility. The College Board has been working for many years with many districts and higher educational institutions in this country and in this state to find ways to both prepare more underrepresented students for rigorous course work long before eleventh and twelfth grade and to identify, and this is especially important in this state, I believe, more qualified underrepresented students who can succeed in the short-term.

In the aftermath of Proposition 209, a lot of things have been said about standardized tests and about grades and GPA, and much of the writings and discussions are overstatements lacking context and perspective. I think it's fair to say that the SAT is one of the most valid and useful tools for students, their parents, school faculty, counselors and admissions offices. The SAT is not the reason that more underrepresented students are not applying, qualifying, admitted, or enrolling, or even completing college. And the SAT is certainly not the reason for the substantial differences that exist among racial and ethnic groups in terms of academic preparation and socioeconomic factors. There's some data in my written statement that I think addresses the issues of real and large differences among ethnic groups even after controlling for income. And that is, one of the criticisms of standardized tests, not just the SAT but of NAEP, NELS and other admissions tests, is that they relate well to socioeconomic status.

Truth be told, grades, high school rank and even parental education relate to socioeconomic factors. That is, minority students coming from the same families with the same incomes do score lower than non-minorities on standardized tests, but they also score substantially lower on high school grades, in college grades, in class rank, and they are much less likely to come from families that have attended college previously. And that is controlling for income.

It's useful to recall, as has been noted in the materials, that the SAT was originally developed to reduce errors or inconsistencies and even possible biases in school records and grades. Precisely because of the important value-added dimension of tests, over 1,410 colleges and universities use the SAT. And contrary to what is often said, the percent of four-year colleges requiring the SAT has grown from 77 percent in 1990 to 82 percent today. The SAT alone is a better predictor of students' college grades in most areas than high school grades. However, again, the combination of SAT and high school grades together provide by far the best prediction. In addition, other factors -- extracurricular activities, commitment, students' statements, motivation -- are important factors that not only determine student grades but are a major contributor in terms of students completing college.

Grades alone are often insufficient and misleading when it comes to predicting student grades. For example, the difference between high school grades and college GPA are quite startling: well over one point on a four point scale. Generally what we find is that high school grades predict that Latinos and African Americans will do substantially better in college than they actually do.

For the University of California system in general, research has illustrated that the most accurate prediction of freshman academic

performance includes high school grades, SAT I and SAT II tests. Because the SAT, in combination with grades, provides the best predication of success for all students, admissions offices rely on these factors as well as many other elements in admissions and in placement decisions.

Approximately 70 percent of students who take the SAT perform consistently with college grades. That is, over 70 percent of students scoring high on the SAT have high grades, scoring moderately on the SAT have moderate grades, and scoring lower on the SAT have lower grades. So the information that the SAT provides to counselors and admissions offices is confirming in most cases. But there are some cases where there are discrepancies between SAT, standardized tests and grades. About 17 percent of times students do have substantially higher high school grades than SAT scores. But even in those cases, the SAT is a slightly better predictor of their freshman GPA than those high school grades that are higher.

As the written testimony illustrates, there are many times that other differences can be found among ethnic groups controlling for the same income. For example, there is some data that shows that the National Assessment of Educational Progress and the National Educational Longitudinal Studies all have similar differences between ethnic groups, and NELS (National Educational Longitudinal Survey) does control for SCS in much the same way. What NELS data shows is that white students in middle socioeconomic groups perform better than Hispanic and African American students coming from high socioeconomic groups in both reading and math.

Results from NAEPS show similar discrepancies at grades 4, 8 and 12. And NAEP, unlike many standardized tests, has been designed, at least in math, to reflect school curriculum, and it includes a vast variety of question

formats, including performance assessments. And these differences among ethnic groups are consistent.

Results from other admissions tests and other tests in employment bear out the same types of differences. However, the differences that we're talking about are not found in tests alone. As the data I provide show, similar differences are found in student grades. For example, in middle income families, 40 percent of students from white and Asian backgrounds, or more, have A averages in high school. Students in middle income families, same middle income levels for African American students, only 16 percent of those students are attaining grades of A's; and Hispanic, the percent is 27 percent. At the highest income level, we find nearly twice as many Asians achieving grades of A's as African Americans. Those are real discrepancies not in test scores but in grades. Similar discrepancies within the same income levels are found in high school ratings, and this is for California seniors. We also find substantial differences within income for college graduation and graduate educations.

Addressing these educational problems is serious. The College Board addresses its shared responsibilities for helping schools and students overcome many of these inequalities through a variety of means, including fee waivers where over 110,000 fee waivers have been granted to California schools this year alone for SAT I and II, and for the first time now, students can qualify for fee waivers in taking the SAT a second time. We provide training materials for test familiarization and early college awareness. We provide talent identification, such as the National Hispanic Scholarship Recognition Program, and workshops to strengthen the academic preparation of underrepresented students well before eleventh grade.

Two College Board programs -- Equity 2000 and Advanced Placement -- have been praised for preparing more students for higher education and especially with Equity 2000 underrepresented groups.

Education Secretary Riley has recently released research based often on Equity 2000 initiatives demonstrating that 83 percent of students completing algebra and geometry in high school enroll in college. That is an important finding, but if students are not enrolling in algebra and geometry in the same proportion, going to college will not be attained. Advanced Placement similarly has made great inroads across all ethnic groups.

Minority college eligibility admissions and success are very complex issues that cannot meaningfully be addressed with simplistic solutions. Setting high academic standards for all students, providing necessary resources, support and expertise, though not easy, can both increase minority enrollment for higher education and provide all students with the skills they will require, not only for entrance into college but for completion of college and success in high-skills workplaces.

The College Board stands ready to collaborate with you and to continue its collaboration with higher ed institutions and secondary schools.

We're very pleased to be testifying today, and I would now like to defer to my colleague, Laurice Sommers, who will discuss some of the unique characteristics of California students where she is employed.

MS. LAURICE SOMMERS: Thank you for the privilege of addressing you today. My name is Laurice Sommers, and I am the college counselor at John C. Fremont High School in Los Angeles Unified School District.

Fremont is a year-round school, multi-track high school that's located in South Central Los Angeles. And Senator Hughes, these families are your constituents.

I have served in L.A. Unified School District for over 28 years and the last 15 as a college counselor. In addition, I'm a trustee of the College Board. And I'm here today to offer the college counselor's perspective of how admissions tests, specifically the SAT, can add value to the college admission process beyond the traditional use of selecting students for college admission. In addition, I'd like to relate how the SAT serves as a national reference for students, as to how well they are prepared for college compared with others across the nation. And finally, I want to share some insights on how tests like the SAT can help shape a more challenging and a more relevant curriculum in individual high schools. I also intend to show you the importance of the PSAT as a counseling tool specifically for first generation high school graduates and college bound students.

(Breaks to move to overhead projector.)

SENATOR HUGHES: It says that 45 percent of our graduates here in California, only 45 percent take the SAT. What percentage of Fremont students are encouraged to take the SAT?

MS. SOMMERS: Encouraged to take the SAT? All of them are encouraged. But last year it was about one-third of the students actually took the SAT I. This year, with the additional SAT fee waivers, we've been able to have a lot more students take the SAT for the first time in the fall of their senior year and retake it. Those students who took it last year in the spring as juniors retook the test as seniors.

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. How often do you contact parents when you offer the student the option of taking the test? I imagine that not every student that you say, "You ought to take the SAT test," they say, "Oh yeah, great, when?" Because I'm sure they can find a whole lot of other things to

do. How frequently do you have conferences with parents to encourage them to have their students take the SATs?

MS. SOMMERS: With the number of students that I'm dealing with, and this is about 4,300 students, a lot of my contact is in groups. I don't have the luxury of doing as much one-on-one counseling as I would love to do, but a lot more meetings with parents, a lot more written communication that goes out in both Spanish and English. I mean, my preference obviously is to do individual counseling with the student and their parent, but that's a luxury I just don't have.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. I looked down this chart that you gave me comparing us to other states. We only have 45 percent of California graduates taking the SAT, and you compare it with other states in the nation. Even the state of Georgia has 63 percent taking SAT. Of course, all of those East Coast places like Maine -- and Maine has 67 percent; Maryland, 64 percent; Massachusetts, really high, 80 percent; New Jersey, 69 percent; New York, 74 percent; Pennsylvania, 72 percent. Texas is the closest to us, but they're even better than we are because they've got 49 percent. What are we doing wrong, or not doing, to see that our students -- and you know, I mentioned Texas and California as comparable sizes, and then you look at the East Coast states who have many of the same problems that we have, and their percentages are tremendously higher. How are we failing? What are we not doing? I want to ask this from the guidance counselor.

MS. SOMMERS: You are asking me?

SENATOR HUGHES: Yes.

MS. SOMMERS: Okay. Well, one of the things that I found is in California, we have a severe shortage of counselors, and I know this topic has already been addressed. Let me give you some specific details. In Los

Angeles Unified School District, in order for a high school to have one counselor, and I'm not talking college counselor, I'm talking all counselors, 550 students. They have two counselors, they have to have an enrollment of 1,550; 2,550 before there are three counselors; 3,550 before there's a fourth counselor, and that's the maximum that the district will fund. If high schools see the need and want to allocate funds for additional counselors, they have to do that in a creative way using other kinds of funds. So to me, that's critical.

Counselors are the people, the very people who work with students in setting goals, in helping the students to meet those goals by taking the correct classes, by taking the tests that are needed, by seeing how important their services learning and extracurricular activities are in meeting those goals, and helping students see the relevance of the courses that they're taking.

The PSAT is another area that I think we're falling down in California, and the PSAT is a preliminary or practice SAT. In California we have fewer students taking the PSAT than take the SAT. So what we're doing, in effect, is sending students into the SAT without the proper practice that they need. And let me show you what the kind of score report that students get back and parents ... (inaudible) ... and then we get a copy. And this is sometimes the first time I have a chance to meet with the student and their family, whether the student takes this test as a ninth grader, tenth grader, or eleventh grader. But this is often my initial contact, and for me it's one of the best counseling tools I have.

You can see the kind of information that they get. We don't concentrate on the scores that the students receive, but we do look critically at the kind of information that they get. Once the student has identified a possible career and college major, suggestions are given about courses to study. And this is

the initial tool that I use to then help the students plan for their future. Where are they in their math sequence, and what courses do they need to continue taking? And so we look onto tenth, eleventh, twelfth grade. And this is often the first time that a parent and a student has seen their cumulative record to see the courses that they've taken and which courses will count as college preparatory courses.

Students also get back a report of their summary of answers. And the College Board is gracious enough to provide professional development to schools that request it in an item analysis. Usually we work specifically in the areas of English and math, but we don't leave out any curricular area, but look at how this relates to the standards that we're teaching in our courses. As a matter of fact, the revisions of the SAT, and consequently the PSAT, are very directly in line with the California State Educational Standards.

So we look at the way students have answered the questions. They get their test booklet back so that they can practice the SAT, and we go over the types of questions that are being asked on the PSAT and help students to see the relevance of continuing taking those difficult challenging math classes.

The new section that was just added is the writing portion, and this has been extremely valuable for our English teachers. We kind of identify it as finding errors, fixing errors in sentences and then improving paragraphs.

The English teachers at our school have looked critically at this information and then looked to see how we can better prepare our students in the English classes to make sure that we're meeting the California standards, the L.A. Unified School District Standards and how they line up with this information.

There is also a composition that students can write and that's an additional piece that the school can purchase, and that's been so helpful to

the English teachers. And I shouldn't just limit it to English teachers, it's actually been helpful to the whole school to see how our students are performing in writing compositions compared with other students. And the teachers score the test, the writing sample, based on a rubric. So it's an excellent way for teachers to gain professional development, to look at their own students, students within the school, and then compare with other students across the nation.

SENATOR HUGHES: Yes, Mr. Peace.

SENATOR PEACE: I know this is going to turn out to be a stupid question, but what the heck. We just recently embraced the standardized test last year. Did anybody ever consider in that debate just requiring the PSAT in tenth grade and then requiring the SAT test in your junior year?

MS. SOMMERS: I think that's a wonderful idea, and I think that one of the things that this committee could do is to propose legislation that would help to fund the PSAT in tenth grade.

SENATOR PEACE: What was the argument against doing that, instead of this other separate -- I mean, there must have been some substantive argument why that was thought by some to not be a good idea. Does anybody know what it was?

MR. CAMARA: I think one of the limitations in use in the PSAT or the SAT for the multiple purposes that you are proposing is that they really weren't designed for those purposes. So in determining how well a school is doing and how well students are doing across the curriculum, you probably do want curriculum-based tests in multiple subject areas.

SENATOR PEACE: Can somebody give me an example of what it wouldn't show? You mean like for non-college bound kids, it would fail to measure how well they're doing, or what?

MR. CAMARA: Well, the SAT is a verbal and reasoning test; developed verbal and mathematical reasoning. In terms of what many tests are administered at eighth, ninth, and tenth grade levels, what states seem increasingly concerned about is accountability for all students, not just college bound students. And so using the test that is designed to develop--

SENATOR PEACE: So a non-college-bound student doesn't need reasoning skills, is that what the theory is here?

MR. CAMARA: No, they do. But the instrument and the way admissions tests are developed, they are developed for students who are going to college, and so the selection of the items, I would contend, on any admissions test would not reflect the curriculum that you have and the contents then that you are adopting in the state, as well as tests that you develop specifically for those purposes. Given that, though, the PSAT certainly would give you some valuable information.

SENATOR PEACE: You know, that's interesting. Let me tell you what employers are telling me about the job skill requirements of mechanics and others that are non-college-educated folk in a modern factory environment -- places where typically people would be headed in terms of "vocational orientation" straight out of high school.

Employers are telling me that those are the very skills that they need and are looking for because the interaction between employees is very different than it was in a historical assembly line mechanical world as opposed to, for lack of a better term, computer digitally-based world that these folks are operating under, and even at the entry-level employee level, that those kinds of interactive skills and reasoning skills and deductive capacity is something they're looking for.

So it's a mystery to me to understand what it is we're seeking to test or understand unless we are just attaching importance to the notion that somebody has memorized who was at Napoleon's side at Waterloo. What is that? I still don't hear anything substantive, that as a parent with an interest in a child who is not headed to college, who wants to get a job, and has a fairly high level of familiarity with both the PSAT and the SAT, I'm hearing you say a lot of long, relatively impressive words that would suggest that it doesn't do the job. But give me something that I can touch and feel and understand. What doesn't it measure?

MS. SOMMERS: Maybe I misunderstood your question, but are you asking about why we don't use the PSAT more just as--

SENATOR PEACE: Instead of doing all this other test stuff -- we're devising this standardized test and all this kind of stuff -- why don't we just "kill two birds with one stone?" For one thing, I'd like my kids to spend a little bit of time in the classroom getting taught as opposed to taking a test every third Thursday.

MS. SOMMERS: We do have preponderance of tests for a variety of reasons.

SENATOR PEACE: I don't know how you can pass a test when you're not getting any time in instruction.

SENATOR HUGHES: I'm sorry. Do you use these tests as a diagnostic tool for teaching and learning? And if not, why not?

MS. SOMMERS: The PSAT is not meant, and--

SENATOR PEACE: I understand it's not meant to, but why doesn't it work?

SENATOR HUGHES: No. I don't mean the PSAT test. I mean tests per se. You know, where you have a system where you have an extensive

testing mechanism, that the teacher can utilize those tests in the same way that a physician uses a battery of tests to find out what's physiologically wrong with the patient. I looked down this list that you gave me and I looked at the states where the percentage of students of graduates take the SAT test. These are states where they have college entrance exams. Seventy-four percent of the students in New York State take the SAT exams. It doesn't mean that 74 percent of the students in New York State even go to college or think of going to college. Pennsylvania, 72 percent. Rhode Island, 70 percent. And when you look at Texas and you look at California, we're down there in the 40's.

We're not doing something right. We're not saying to our kids, "Go and bite of the apple and see if you like the taste. Become test wise. Become sophisticated." And these very same people, I'm sure, probably score high on civil service examinations, and so they get the jobs in the federal government, they get the jobs in the state government, and where do our students go? How do they score? A test is not a threat to them. A test to them is a game and an opportunity to play in the game.

MS. SOMMERS: Well, let me tell you one thing that happened with L.A. Unified School District. We all know -- and Mr. Peace, you're talking about your children -- their motivation to go on to college started when they were in the womb. But for first generation students going on to college who maybe don't know other people who have gone to college, the PSAT is a way, and probably the first way, for those students to say to their parents, their friends, their teachers, "I'm going to college."

SENATOR PEACE: I don't think there's any dispute with that. And I think that's the point the Chair is making. From a standpoint of trying to assure that brightest breath of opportunity across the board of likelihood of

getting kids moving toward going to college and making decisions in that direction, exposure to these tests is a smart thing to do.

But there's a real important corollary question that I still haven't gotten an answer to. There has always been a resistance, which I do not yet understand -- and I'm a little slower than the rest of you -- to simply use the practice SAT test and the SAT test as the two standard tests we give to every kid, make them take it. It has all those benefits and it also has the benefits to make use of in terms of using this evaluation of how schools are doing that everybody is concerned about. There's been an argument that those tests are not appropriate to make that evaluation. I don't understand why they're not appropriate.

MR. CAMARA: I'll try to answer that directly. And certainly, as an employee of the College Board, it would probably be in the best interest to sell as many tests for as many purposes as possible, but I don't think professionally that would be a very ethical position to take. The truth is that I think having all students take the PSAT in tenth or eleventh grade would be a tremendously good experience. Some states subsidize those fees so that all students do have the availability, because it gives them an opportunity to realize that they also could succeed in college.

SENATOR PEACE: If we did that in tenth grade, you would also argue that that would not be helpful for us in terms of evaluating relative performance of schools.

MR. CAMARA: It will give you an indication in terms of the relative standing of schools possibly, but to hold a school or even a student accountable, or a teacher accountable for students' PSAT scores or SAT scores would not be valid and would not be fair. Similar, some of the tests that states are imposing right now, I would suggest holding teachers and schools

accountable may be less than fair because of the very basic differences we've talked about.

SENATOR PEACE: That's a general argument about tests per se. What I'm asking is what is it about this test that would be different than some other tests which we seem to be very busy about reinventing the wheel over? And obviously I'm missing something.

MR. CAMARA: Well, it's just not designed to do that.

SENATOR PEACE: Tell me what it doesn't cover. You've told me that about fifteen times. Tell me what it doesn't do.

MR. CAMARA: It does not cover social studies. It does not cover science. And even using the SAT II tests, which are subject tests and do have measures of biology and chemistry and mathematics, they are geared to a much more difficult level of curriculum that the majority of students in the state of California do not take.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Senator Hayden, you have tremendous experience in chairing Higher Education. Wouldn't you join us here for at least five minutes and let people see more than the back of your head and give us some of your inspiration and your thoughts on this, because we're all trying to solve this tremendous puzzle.

Come on, shed some light. Give us your thoughts.

SENATOR HAYDEN: I can't. Madam Chair, I'm very intrigued with this issue, and we've been watching on the television. Stephanie Rubin, from my staff, and I have been working on this. I only wanted to thank you for this investigation trying to get to the bottom of these issues and offer an equity issue for your consideration.

I'm trying to work on legislation to address the following equity issue. In the schools that I see, the upwardly mobile or upper class or middle class

parents spend an incredible amount of money, in the thousands of dollars, to send their kids to private tutoring academies to prepare them to do better on the SAT, and I think that this creates an unequal access problem. It creates a barrier based on income because the students who get this extra private tutoring are likely to do better, not because they're smarter but because they've been tutored.

I don't know what the solution is, but I'm trying to develop a bill, and this committee could help me greatly with input. I started out saying, "Let's get rid of the SAT unless every kid in California can get a voucher or get the funding to get a tutor so that they're on an equal playing field." Or, "Let's keep these tests but find some way through the education budget that every student has a way to get this extra tutoring." Because I just think with all of these Prop. 209 issues and equal access issues before us, the nub of this problem of access and equity and closing doors of higher education just comes down to whether the parents have $3,000 to pay a tutor. That's what they're spending in West Los Angeles. And I don't know if anybody's regulating the tutors, but they're just teaching them how to take the test better, and I think it's demonstrable if you put in four or five extra hours a week learning how to take a test better, you will. And so you'll get an edge on other kids simply because your parents could afford the tutor.

I don't know the solution, but that's the problem I wanted to come down to raise with you, and I don't know if it sheds any light on it. But I think it's more than the question of what the tests test for; it's who has access to the test, and that's based on income.

SENATOR HUGHES: Yeah. And then when I looked at the percentages, our percentages are very, very low. The percentages of students

in this state that even take the tests, and that concerns me too. And that may be part of it, and it may not be.

I'm sorry, I interrupted you.

MS. SOMMERS: No, you're fine. Let me add another--

SENATOR PEACE: Just in terms of corroborating evidence, my oldest son improved his SAT score by over 200 points between the first time and the second time. I didn't spend the $3,000, but we got him just one of these computer programs, software programs, that help him practice doing the test, and that was the only material difference. And they generally say, what, it's about 100 points if you take it a second time, the general experience?

MR. CAMARA: The chances of increasing your score on the SAT by 200 points is less than 1 in 300, so your son should be commended. The average score increase is about 25 points on verbal and math, and 1 in 20 students will increase it by 100 points.

SENATOR HUGHES: Whoever sold you that computer sold you a good product.

SENATOR PEACE: It's either that or he had a bad hair day the first time.

MS. SOMMERS: Let me add another dimension to this, Mr. Hayden, because this is something from L.A. Unified School District. It shows that students increase their scores -- and I use this with students. I also use it with our staff to show that students who take a more rigorous college preparatory program get better scores. Don't stop taking math with two years of math -- that's the minimal requirement for graduation from L.A. Unified School District -- but continue taking a third year of math, and now we're talking college prep math. Take a fourth year of math and look at the

chances that you have of increasing your score. And I do this with Fremont High School. This is L.A. Unified in all those subject areas, but Fremont High School in English and math. These are our own students. I show this to the tenth and eleventh and twelfth graders. I show it to the parents, and I show it to our staff and our administrators. And now, for next year, we're adding additional sections of Algebra II, Trigonometry, Calculus, and we're adding a support system that will help those students who go on and take more difficult math and English classes so that they're not going to slip through the cracks, so that they have study groups, they have resources to go to.

If you want to do better on the SAT or any college admission test, take stronger classes. Read. And an interesting little piece of tidbit, have a family dinner every once in a while, once a week, when you can talk to your children about what they're doing in their school.

SENATOR MCPHERSON: Madam Chair? We just had a discussion a couple of weeks ago about improving the classes -- or increasing the workload that a student would have to take before he or she graduated, and it didn't get out of the committee. But we have to prepare these students probably better. That's what your statement just was -- they have to take them, but we have to provide for them to take it too.

Another thing that concerns me, though, is those students entering CSU are taking remedial math and remedial English, and somewhere we're missing it. Maybe there's too many students per classroom, which we're trying to get from kindergarten up through three for beginners. What do you think of that? Why is that such a high number, do you think? Half of the students graduating from high school and going to CSU have to take a remedial class in English or math.

MS. SOMMERS: Well, I'm certainly not going to answer for all the students, but from my point of view, what I see at Fremont High School, students can take the classes, but they still need to pass the entry-level math test and the English placement test to be able to enter -- once they're enrolled at the Cal State system to take the appropriate level of course work in English and math; otherwise, if they don't score at the cutoff, then they're placed into remedial classes. So even though students may have taken the appropriate course work, if they're not able to pass this other objective test, they're going to be placed in remedial courses.

Now, what the information from the SAT has helped us to do, and also looking at how well our students are doing once they get into college, it's helped us to say, "Are we setting our sights high enough? Have we lowered our standards?" So the SAT provides us with an objective national look at our students, and in many cases we've said, "We may not be expecting enough." And usually our students, when the expectation is high, they'll rise to that expectation.

And I can give you a perfect example. We've been working with Santa Monica College. They're offering two college-level classes for our students after school, and one of them is Psychology Child Development. We've got a lot of students who are interested in that area, and we don't have the place in our curriculum to offer psychology this year. The professor, Dr. Simms, she has certain expectations because this is a college level class, and I see the students begin to answer questions in the way that they would for a high school level and she says, "I'm sorry. That's not answering the question that I've asked. It's not answering in complete sentences. It's not providing the detail or supporting your opinion." And they stop, and they think, and they go right back and rise to her expectations. So part of it is working within my

school with our staff to say, "Our expectations have to be here, and we're going to supply the support for students and the support and professional development for teachers, but keep those expectations high."

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you very much. All right. Mr. Chapman, we certainly haven't forgotten about you. This is not an SAT show, this is an ACT show also. This is a double feature. So let's hear from you as the Assistant Vice President, ACT.

MR. DALLAS CHAPMAN: Thank you, Senator Hughes. I've been trying to restrain myself because many of the issues apply equally to ACT, and then there are some distinct differences as well.

I'm the Regional Assistant Vice President for ACT and manage the West Field Services based here in Sacramento. I'm pleased to be here today. I apologize for my voice. I seem to have a bit of laryngitis from a little infection, but I'll try to get through this.

ACT is an independent, not-for-profit organization, and it provides a wide variety of educational services to students and parents. It's governed by an ACT corporation consisted of elected representatives from 37 states. Two of those state councils are in California and have been since 1960 when we first started administering the test here.

ACT was founded in 1959 by E. F. Lindquist, who was concerned about college admissions testing reflecting what students actually learn in high school in college preparatory courses and what skills and information are necessary to be successful at the college level. And so he developed a test which -- and I would like to read from his principles -- "Would test broad competencies, rather than rote memorization. Encourage students both to acquire knowledge and to learn how to use it creatively. Would consist in large part of exercises requiring students to interpret and evaluate critically

the same kinds of reading materials that they will have occasion to read and study in college and that will require them to do the same kinds of complex reasoning and problem solving they will have to do later in and out of school."

The ACT Assessment includes a battery of high school curriculum-based achievement tests designed to assess students' critical reasoning and higher-order thinking skills in the four content areas: English, mathematics, reading and science reasoning. Because the tests measure the skills and knowledge that the students learn in high school and that they need to succeed in college, ACT scores provide straightforward, easily interpreted information about the student's readiness to undertake college level work. We believe that when properly used, this information will promote the success of students in college.

We believe -- and I'd like to make four or five points here -- that because ACT is a curriculum-based achievement test, the ACT Assessment is an effective and appropriate component of both admissions and course placement decisions. And please note that we always combine those two because that relates to ACT's early philosophy of helping to place students, even in the land-grant colleges in the Midwest where it started who had to admit everyone, and it was a matter of placing students at the appropriate place. The ACT test has never taken the position that they establish a student's potential. They have always taken the position of establishing a foundation, indicating what they have learned to date and what they're capable of doing with what they have learned.

What it does indicate is help the student and the educators working with them -- counselors, parents, college admissions, and advising

personnel -- what am I ready to learn next? Where am I ready to start my learning? So the placement of students at the proper level is the most important issue in all of this.

We think of learning as an educational ladder, with all students we assume capable of learning. Then there clearly is a strong association between the courses they're taking, the rigor, the expertise with which they're presented -- some of the similar data that the College Board has presented here in terms of a high relationship between the courses, the college preparatory courses taken, the grades received in those, and their performance on the ACT, and subsequent performance in college freshmen and even to graduation -- for college freshman grades.

SENATOR HUGHES: Is it true that most students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds do better on ACT than they do on the SAT?

MR. CHAPMAN: I can't speak directly to that, Senator, because I don't have comparative data for the same tested students. Often students take one or the other. There is a substantial number that takes both for entrance to the universities all over the country. And from those we find that there clearly are -- and there are charts in your materials, I won't go through those, that shows that there are differences between socioeconomic and ethnic groups on the performance of the ACT as there are on all the other tests. The same points that Mr. Camara made can be made here because there are inequities in the educational opportunity and the delivery and the instruction. And the ACT tests do reflect those differences in what the students have learned. And we submit that that is really what the differences describe, is the differences in opportunity and actual learning that has taken place rather than the bias in the test. And I could go on for pages, and I presented that to you. In the interest of time and your previous

request, I will not read that to you, but I would encourage you to look at it. We carefully prepared the brief and a lot of supporting documentation.

The ACT Assessment Program, along with the preliminary ACT, which is called the PLAN, administered to about half a million students across the country and probably 20,000 or more in California each year, is an excellent preparation for the ACT and a general good planning tool for academic and career planning. And then an eighth grade tool, called Explorer, was administered in many school districts around the country, and quite a few in California are administering this whole thing as a way of early identification, early intervention, early career exploration, helping students tie realistic career possibilities with the academic requirements necessary to get there to help them start taking the right courses as early as eighth grade, junior high. And we believe, as has been said many, many times in your papers and the hearings, that the early intervention, early identification probably can't start too early. Junior high is probably awfully late, but it's an awful lot better than junior and senior years.

We would just make the point in as many different ways as we can, Senator, that we are as concerned as you about the lack of appropriate educational opportunity and experiences and access. And we believe that that really needs to be addressed in terms of the instructional and support components. We believe that there is tremendous evidence that standardized tests of the quality of the ACT and the SAT are accurate measures of what students know and how they're likely to do at the postsecondary level. Unless there are significant interventions, remedial courses -- it's a sad thing that so many students entering the CSU system are assigned to remedial courses. Think how sad it would be if they were not. What are their chances of success?

My point is these are tools that are designed to help ensure student success. They're not gatekeepers. They're not barriers. Used properly they help to identify early strengths and weaknesses, help in a diagnostic fashion. The reports on the PLAN, as with the tenth grade , the preliminary ACT are used by many high school teachers around the country to look at and help correct deficiencies, starting in the tenth grade. It's a little late, but that's much better than waiting until the junior and senior year, again.

So I would make the point that ethnic and socioeconomic differences are real differences. But in every case, when you adjust for the courses taken, students who do not take the core curriculum score significantly lower than those who do, or stated more positively, students who take a rigorous high school curriculum and do well on it. And admittedly the caveat there is that some schools may provide the course, but they don't provide the quality and level of instruction. There is some caveat there. But students score approximately three points higher on the ACT. Now, three points out of a total of 36 is a significant number.

So taking a significantly more rigorous high school program, college preparatory courses makes a tremendous difference regardless of racial, ethnic, socioeconomic background. If they take the right courses, they score significantly better on our tests and do better in college. The connections are just really set.

SENATOR HUGHES: So the bigger the challenge in high school, the more able they are to reach the challenge of college.

MR. CHAPMAN: Yes.

SENATOR HUGHES: And probably the challenge of a responsible job too. I think they're directly related.

All right. Thank you very much. This has been a very exciting panel. We're sorry that we kept you so long, but we had so many questions to ask.

Our next panel now is "Students' and Parents' Response to Standardized Tests." This is something that we've been eluding to the entire time. Now we're going to hear from real people; the personal accounts of people who have impacts of the SAT and ACT.

Karen Gau, student at Whitney High School. Benigno Delgado, student at UC Santa Cruz. Carlos Jackson, student at Cal State Chico. Mary Kay Stamets, a parent at Carmichael Parent Teachers Association, and Paul Kanarek, President of The Princeton Review.

All right. First we'd like to hear from Karen who had a perfect SAT. How did you do that?

MS. KAREN GAU: Good afternoon. First, I'd like to thank you for inviting me here. My name is Karen Gau, and I'm a student, currently a senior, at Whitney High School, which is an ABC School District.

First of all, I'd like to say that I feel very lucky to belong to a very wonderful school and district. I think that my success on the SAT is due to an excellent curriculum at our school. It's a challenging educational program. It's very rigorous, as well as a supportive environment created by the teacher, the staff there.

I contribute my success to three major aspects of my school: First, I have to say that we enjoy an excellent program. For example, in English, students create a writing portfolio full of essays, reports and creative projects that we collect over the years. In foreign language, such as in Spanish, we learn by creating and performing skits. And since everything has to be in Spanish we learn very quickly, and we learn how to apply our language that we learn into real-life situations. And we also are encouraged to watch

Spanish TV, which is really fun. And so by the end of three or four years in foreign language classes, we can understand native speakers pretty well. Also, in civics, we don't just learn by the book, but every day we discuss current events so that we can actually apply the concepts we learn in our books to actual events that are happening every day.

And also in math -- this is kind of interesting -- sometimes when we take math classes, such as if we learn the quadratic equation, we think, "When are we ever going to use this?" But we find out that it really does help in the real world. For example, in calculus, we make calc videos, and in these videos we film ourselves, we create story lines, and then we employ calculus techniques to solve problems. For example, in one video we used calculus to solve a murder mystery. And also, in another video, we had Indiana Jones. He was looking for hidden treasure and he had to solve many problems; solve integrals and adding derivatives to get the hidden treasure.

The second part of our school that I find very admirable is that teachers have very high expectations of us, and since they encourage us to perform our very best, we rise to their expectations and we do well. For example--

SENATOR HUGHES: Do your parents also have high expectations of you?

MS. GAU: Yes. Our parents are very supportive of us, as well as the community.

For example, in biology, our teachers expect us to be prepared when we come to class. Since summer, we have to answer around 90 essay questions, or 96 essay questions about biology and chemistry. So when school starts, we already have a strong background in biochemistry, so we can plunge right into animals and fungi. And in English, in the summer we read several core literature novels so that when school starts we can discuss them already.

And in U.S. History, by the time school starts, we should know all the presidents, their names, their year elected, terms served and their political party. And so we have a very strong backbone in U.S. History by the time September comes.

And since teachers expect us to prepare before class, we don't just have lectures that we listen to and we take notes of. In class we have very lively discussions and active interactions. We even have debates, and we learn by interacting with our teachers who treat us as scholars, not just as students.

And I think the most important part about my school, in my school's program, is that the teachers are extremely dedicated to us. For example, they're always willing to spend extra time to help us. In science, you can find that our science teachers are always available before and after school. So whenever we have questions, we can go and ask them and beg them for help.

And in English, we have an example here of -- like sometimes after school, our teacher even takes us to Starbuck's, and over coffee we discuss poetry and talk about philosophies and life in general. So it's very exciting and stimulating. And in calculus, again, our calculus teacher prepares us very well. For the month before AP exams, which are in May, every Saturday we have calc marathons and our teacher devotes her entire Saturday to help us do practice tests, go over problems we don't understand, so you really feel the support. And we also have lots of extracurricular activities that our teachers provide for us, and again, they devote their after-school time, their weekends, for MUN, for Spacecet(?), for Academic Decathlon. Our Spacecet(?) teacher even makes us the best chocolate chip cookies in the world to keep us going.

SENATOR HUGHES: Have you ever been afraid of taking a test? Have you ever been uptight about whether you could compete with your

classmates? I know you always wanted to get the best grade, but have you ever really been uptight about that?

MS. GAU: Well, I think that with any test, any timed test, there's always an inherent amount of stress or pressure. With the education program that's at our school, you feel kind of prepared. I mean, you're always worried, "What if I run out of time," or "What if I feel sick," or "What if I have a headache or something." It's really hard to take a test under pressure because of time, but then it's not as bad as you would imagine.

SENATOR HUGHES: So do you ever have friends who are -- I'm sure that you probably have friends in your class who have taken the same test, and everybody doesn't have as healthy an outlook as you have on it. Do you ever help these friends? What do you do for them?

MS. GAU: Yeah, we have cram sessions before a test, and sometimes we just get together and work out problems that we don't understand. We're always nervous about tests. Who isn't? Unless you were really, really, very, very calm and collected and totally confident, you would be nervous about any test. But we help each other. We have tutoring programs in fact.

SENATOR HUGHES: Good.

MS. GAU: I'm the president of our California Scholarship Federation Club, our chapter, in our school. And we have a tutoring program there where we have members sign up to be tutors, and we have tutorees sign up at the counseling office, so we help them that way too.

SENATOR HUGHES: So you actually have peer tutors.

MS. GAU: Yes. Peer tutors. But that's also helped a lot by teachers who actually do help us a lot in their extra time. We have teacher tutors too.

SENATOR MCPHERSON: Madam Chair.

SENATOR HUGHES: Yes. Senator.

SENATOR MCPHERSON: How many students do you have in your classroom?

MS. GAU: In our classroom?

SENATOR MCPHERSON: Yeah, an average.

MS. GAU: It varies because for AP classes we generally have smaller classes, but the cap is around 35, I think. So they're pretty good-sized classes.

SENATOR HUGHES: What are your aspirational goals? What university do you want to go to or what business do you want to be engaged in? What do you want to be?

MS. GAU: I think I want to be a doctor. But I'm still exploring my options.

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. We'll still have a lot of sick people so we'll still need you.

All right.

MS. GAU: Would you like me to continue?

SENATOR HUGHES: Sure.

MS. GAU: And I'd just like to say that because of the really rigorous curriculum at our school, sometimes it's really hard to get a very high GPA because the classes are hard, the tests are hard, so not everybody can get a 4.0 or a 3.9, but then there are many highly qualified students in our school who do not get as high -- like they don't get exceptionally high GPAs, but they do score very well on standardized tests. Our average is quite high, in the 1300's for our school.

I just have a concern because -- I mean, from my personal standpoint, I think that without standardized testing, colleges might not be able to see when they review applicants -- they wouldn't be able to distinguish between one student that is more qualified and another student that is not as qualified

with the same GPA, but from different schools with different standards. So that might be something you might want to consider.

Thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SALLY HAVICE: I would like to add something if I may.

SENATOR HUGHES: Surely.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HAVICE: I'd like to add that Karen also, with all this studying and hard work, still has time to volunteer as a community representative from her school to my Youth Advisory Council for the 56th Assembly District. She is from not only an exceptional school but an exceptional school district as well. And we're all very proud of her.

MS. GAU: Thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you.

Mr. Delgado, student at UC Santa Cruz.

MR. BENIGNO DELGADO: I'd also like to thank you for inviting me here. I also attended a very competitive high school. I attended the California Academy of Mathematics and Science and concurrently enrolled at Cal State University, Dominguez Hills.

SENATOR HUGHES: I know, which my legislation created. Thank you for going there.

MR. DELGADO: Definitely a very competitive school. Wonderful programming. We had mentors. We had pretty much about everything. I was the second entering class and the graduating class was of 119. So it's a fairly small school. A lot of attention. Just a wonderful school. I had mentors. I had pretty much -- like I said, all the programs were there in place for myself. I had done work with Hughes Aircraft as an internship with help

from my mentor. So I had a lot of advantages, I think, at my high school and, also, that they paid for my classes that I took at Cal State University, Dominguez Hills.

But I scored poorly in my SATs, which was kind of a shock not only for myself but I think for a lot of the students at that high school who also did poorly and usually were people of color; Black and Latino, specifically. And this was quite a shock because I had placed first place in the science fair. I was very involved with the solar cells and creating a heliostat. When I was at Hughes Aircraft, I was actively working on a fuel cell. And so like my science was very competitive, I'd say. I was also in the English AP, which was something that you got placed into at my high school, because given that there's a very small class it's very competitive to get into, and I was one of the fortunate students that was placed in the AP students. So I believe that my abilities at that high school weren't necessarily behind from any other students, but rather, that I was one of the more competitive students at that high school.

I'm currently attending UC Santa Cruz, and I've done well in all of my class works. I do a lot of research work with a lot of the professors. A lot of independent work. I'm currently the University of California Student Association representative for undergrad students there. I sit on the Latinos Affairs Commission for Santa Cruz County. I've done a lot of state work. I've worked with MECHA. I've pretty much, I believe, have been very successful at UC Santa Cruz.

But I think my SAT score said something else. And I believe that there's something inherent in the SAT scores because I don't believe that it's the Latino or Black community that's the problem. I think that it's something inherent in those tests, because obviously, if I'm doing well in the

UC Santa Cruz campus, working well with the professors, actively involved with a lot of the research there, then there's some discrepancies. And the correlation then between the SAT and how well you perform in the universities and postsecondary education, which is what it's supposed to be doing as far as it goes, it's not working, and so there's a problem there in the SATs, as far as I see. And I think that it discouraged a lot of the students. It made a lot of students uncomfortable around one another because a lot of the Latino and Black students at that high school felt a little bit uncomfortable with other, mostly white students who scored very high in their SAT scores, but in classes were very competitive with one another, were very competitive in the different programs that they were involved and extracurricular activities.

So in essence, like I said, it's something I believe inherent in the SAT. And also, I think they've also discussed about families and family values. I know that my parents brought me up believing in education, and so I don't see it as a family structure problem, or, like I said, it's not the Latino or Black communities' problems per se, but rather, something inherent in the SATs. And I think that that's what should be looked at.

SENATOR HUGHES: Do you think there's any cultural bias in the SAT?

MR. DELGADO: I do. I believe that there's cultural bias in the SATs. And I think that that's kind of what needs to be looked at because, like I stated earlier, I'm doing very well at UC Santa Cruz with academics, extracurricular activities, and even more so, I just wanted to really stress that out. And that there's also something with our education, K-12, that I think we really need to look at, because I think that I was very fortunate to attend camps, but a lot of students are not, and a lot of the schools don't offer

the classes, which is a big problem. The counselor who previously said that she's the only counselor for Fremont High, I think that's a disgrace. I mean, what is that? That's really sad, I'd have to say. And I grew up actually in South Central -- John Muir Junior High, which is right in the heart of South Central.

But I think that I don't consider myself an exception by any standards. I think that the students I was in classes with, even in South Central, in junior high, did very well and very competitive. But I think that there was a loss of interest by a lot of the administration and teachers and counselors. And I think that should really be looked at -- at what kind of support they're getting there. And I also think that has a lot to do with what the cultural kind of expertise and knowledge of the teachers with the students in those classes. So I think overall, that that's one of the main concerns that should be looked at.

SENATOR HUGHES: What's your classification now? Your academic classification.

MR. DELGADO: I'm a junior. Third-year student.

SENATOR HUGHES: What is your major?

MR. DELGADO: I'm studying Latin America/Latino Studies and politics, a combined major. And actually, I had entered into a three-two dual program with UC Santa Cruz and Berkeley, which I would get my BA in humanities at Santa Cruz and then move on to Berkeley and do electrical engineering. That's what I was going to be doing, but I've kind of changed and I've kind of put aside my science. But I've become more interested in the policies, I think, and this is exactly why.

And I think another reason for why I've excelled in a lot of my classes is because of the extracurricular work that I've been doing outside of the classes and trying to bring that back into the classes.

SENATOR HUGHES: Any questions from members?

Thank you very much.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAVICE: I'd like to ask you if you find that the quality of instruction at the university is -- well, I'll change the word quality -- the approaches that the teachers use are very different from the approaches that were used in your high school or any other area of your K-12 experience.

MR. DELGADO: Definitely. I think that at a university where you're allowed, with the exception of your GEs -- general education classes that you need to take -- you can take the classes that you'd like to take. And kind of, I think, that there's a lack of cultural expertise in a lot of the K-12 -- of a lot of the teachers that I think that are crucial. And I think that a lot of the time why students, specifically Black and Latino students, aren't invested in their education is because they don't see role models. A lot of the teachers in front of them are white teachers who don't really have an understanding for their community and who they are as people. And I think that that's crucial if you're a role model to students, that you understand where they're coming from. And I think another solution, possibly with K-12, is to get more Latino and Black teachers into the schools, and counselors who, I think, the students would definitely benefit.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAVICE: Beyond the role model in the classroom, during your university experience, what would you recommend be emulated by K-12 teachers -- high school teachers, for example?

MR. DELGADO: I think a lot of the -- and specifically with literature and English courses, that they incorporate, I think, a lot of the rich different cultures of Latino, Black and other Asian American wonderful writers and in classes of art. In all segments of education, I think that there are scholarly work by people of color but are usually not included in a lot of the K-12.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HAVICE: So you think it provides more motivation to include that material.

I taught English for 23 years and I had the opportunity of meeting an awful lot of people. And during that experience, I taught remedial freshmen comp, the two levels in literature, and I think if I were to make one statement about teaching at a college level -- community college -- and I would direct that to something that was mentioned about remedial education in college, is that the work that's done, whatever the task is to learn, needs to relate to the real world. It needs to relate to -- just as Karen mentioned a little earlier -- the teachers had a way or have a way of making calculus a reality, and they solved problems by using the problems that they're learning or by using whatever they're learning in class, in writing. Many students I saw in remedial education and remedial classes, all they needed was something to write about and some practice in doing that and then they just would fly after that.

I don't know if that relates to the SAT so much as to the way I view education, but I think there's some connection that maybe we can make a little later on.

SENATOR HUGHES: Our next witness will be Carlos Jackson from Cal State Chico. And Carlos, I'd like to start out by asking you, what do you know about ACT and did you take it? Did you take SAT?

MR. CARLOS JACKSON: Well, first of all I'd like to thank the Senate Select Committee on Higher Education for having me here today, yourself, Chairman Hughes, and especially Jamillah Moore for contacting me. I appreciate that.

As far as ACT is concerned, it never entered my mind in high school. It wasn't something that was important to me. It wasn't even an option. SAT was the only thing that was presented to me and it was the only thing I thought about taking.

Here today, I'm speaking on behalf of the California State Student Association, which represents all 330,000 students in the CSU system, and on behalf of my fraternity, Alpha Phi Fraternity, Incorporated.

I just want to say that my high school situation was different from both of my peers here, but I think it will be an interesting contrast. He was coming from a Latino perspective and I come from the perspective of a Black man in America.

And my high school, I thought, was very good at preparing me for the SATs until I heard the high school experience that these people had, and mine just paled in comparison.

I went to a very middle-class, but rural high school in Northern California in a small town called Orland; 5,000 people. There was 100 people in my graduating class. And I would say the main difference between myself and other people who go to a more "normal" high school is that we were pushed towards college, and we were given educational tracks to get ourselves there. Specifically in my last year of high school, we had what was called English for College Prep. There was a college prep class and a non-college prep class. In that class was the only exposure we really had to

training ourselves for the SATs. So I felt that where I came from, that was beneficial on my behalf.

I scored 960 on the SAT, mediocre at best. I think my GPA in high school was about 3.2. And as far as admissions to college go, I really think your GPA in high school is a lot more important than your SAT scores. It shows four years' worth of work instead of how well you've been trained to think in a specific situation for a few hours on a Saturday afternoon. And in that you can see where students are going.

In my situation I had got to where my freshman year GPA was as low as 1.8, and by my junior and senior year I was consistently getting 3.5's. So it shows you what direction that those students were going. Additionally, I think, extracurricular activities shouldn't be overlooked, as opposed to just straight looking at the SATs. If you combine somebody's GPA score with what they do outside the classroom -- you know, life is always a series of tradeoffs, and this young lady here is extremely intelligent and she's lucky enough that she can pull off community service and still score perfect on the SATs. Some people can't do that, and I think that should be reflected when people are admitted to school.

Just to speak to a couple of the issues as far as high school counseling, I know myself, I went out on behalf of my fraternity to speak to Black students in the Northern California area. And for the whole issue of counselors, I think, "Well, what can I do to get into school? Fill out my financial aid papers, take my test," all that. They didn't even know they had a counselor to go to, much less take advantage of that situation and so--

SENATOR HUGHES: How did you get to know that you had a counselor to go to?

MR. JACKSON: I really didn't go to a counselor. I mean, myself, I did come from a single-parent background, lower socioeconomic status, all that that's supposed to work against you, but my mom -- basically I took the onus on myself to go out and do what I needed to do to get myself in college. My mother told me that this is what I needed to do, but she didn't get past high school, so it wasn't so much that she could help me with it. I relied on my friends a lot. I'd find somebody in the class that did better than I did and I'd go to their house the night before and study with them for tests. That was my major means of preparation. But, you know, I did come from a smaller school so I did have time to go and talk to my counselors -- or not my counselors but my instructors before or after class to get help on classwork also.

SENATOR HUGHES: In college, how has your membership in your fraternity helped you, if at all?

MR. JACKSON: My membership in my fraternity is the best thing I ever did in my life. I love my fraternity to death. More so than that, I think this is a good example of why extracurricular activities are good. I'm here because I got involved in my Associated Students, which is our student government. When I go to apply for a job after I receive my master's degree, this is something that I can point to and say, "Well, on such and such a date I've already testified before the Senate," and that will be good because I want to get into politics. And that's why I say--

SENATOR HUGHES: We'll all vote for you.

MR. JACKSON: Thank you. I appreciate that.

If anybody needs a fellow the year after next--

SENATOR HUGHES: All right.

MR. JACKSON: But I think that's why extracurricular activities should be looked at as far as the GPA requirement.

There's really two main issues that I've seen today and it's what does the test test? Does the SAT test what's important to get into college? And in my opinion, not really. In high school you learn how to memorize things. You learn how to memorize information and you spit it back on a test. College is different. It's applied knowledge. That's the first difference you realize when you go to college. In high school you give an answer and that's fine. In college you give an answer and your professor says, "Why?" And you have to apply the knowledge you've learned to that specific situation. In that respect I think the SAT fails.

Additionally, the other question is why are only 45 percent of the students taking the test? And that's because I think high schools are failing to prepare students to go into this nature. Like I said, we had two tracks, and it was very evident in my high school, because there was only 100 students in my class -- 50 of us were in college prep, 50 of us weren't -- and the 50 of us that were in college prep went on to college and the 50 that weren't didn't. And so I think that's something that we have to look at when we talk about the SAT in relation to college.

And then additionally beyond that, there's a couple of other issues. You may be an artist or a musician trying to go to college. The SAT is going to provide you no kind -- it's not going to show any scope of knowledge. You may know Chopin like the back of your hand, but you may not be that good in math. And that's not going to reflect that.

As regards to the sliding scale, the SAT -- as you know, I have a 2.7, I don't have a 3.0, so I don't automatically qualify to get into CSU like I did. I think that's kind of a Catch-22 situation: You're taking a person who is academically lacking, and say they have to strive on a test that's hard anyway. If they are academically lacking it's probably because they come

from a situation where the resources aren't such to provide them the education that they need. In case of that, to tell them to take this test to prove that they're academically eligible to get into college doesn't necessarily make a lot of sense.

I would suggest, me personally, if people are asking for substitutions, obviously the best way to do this would be some type of interview system. I realize we can't interview the 500,000 students coming into this system over the next five or ten years, whatever tidal wave two is going to take, but there may be some type of system where you could write an essay, "Why I deserve to be in college," or "Why I believe I should go to college," and that could be scored. I understand the SAT is used because it's easily administratable and it's easily readable, but that doesn't mean it's necessarily good.

SENATOR HUGHES: Any further questions?

All right. Thank you very much.

Mary Kay Stamets, a parent, Carmichael Parent Teachers Association.

MS. MARY KAY STAMETS: Good afternoon. I am the mother of two students who have taken the standardized test, and I've been invited to be here today by the California State PTA.

At first I shrunk away from the invitation to be here because I felt I didn't have anything to offer because our experience as parents is extremely easy. We frankly didn't do anything. But as I started to think about our experience with what I observed -- although we weren't very active in preparing our daughters, I was there to observe what was taking place -- I thought more deeply about some of the concepts, and I spoke with some other people and I decided that I was eager to be here and happy to be.

First, I'd like to give you a little background of the type of students my daughters are and then I'd like to make six observations and share those with you.

Both of our kids attended public schools in the San Juan School District in Sacramento County. Our oldest daughter, Alexa, graduated from El Camino High School with a weighted grade point average that exceeded 4.0. She was active in student government and editor-in-chief of the school's yearbook during her senior year. She's now a junior engineering student at UC Berkeley.

Our daughter, Ashley, is a senior at Mira Loma High School in Sacramento. I see a lot of peer pressure in Ashley and her classmates. It is an unusual kind of peer pressure. They vie for grades and they vie for high scores on their SAT.

Twenty-four of her classmates are national merit scholar semi-finalists, and twenty-five others have commended status. Four students at her school this year have scored perfect 1600 scores on the SAT. She's in an unusual pool of high achieving students who are candidates for the International Baccalaureate Program. Plus, she is heavily involved in seven school and community organizations. This gives you a background on peer motivations.

And the observations that I'd like to make are these: One: Our children relied on their academic experience, their participation in school and community activities, and their essays for admission into universities. Neither of our daughters took the preparation for these exams seriously. Neither of them studied for these tests. They relied on their early education and their rigorous classes they had from seventh grade forward, and the test taking strategies they learned in the fourth grade.

Essentially, both girls were too busy with their other commitments to study and review for these tests. And I would rather that they gain the experience at such jobs as yearbook editor and senior class president than take time to study for these exams.

My second point is the importance of a good SAT score on one's life substantially outweighs the scope of material tested, therefore biasing college admission towards the students who excel in a narrow scope of the content. A high score on the SAT does not guarantee success in college. And I have an example: My daughter, Alexa, had an SAT score of 1160 and she gained admission to the College of Engineering at Berkeley. While her score was marginal, I am very pleased with her performance at Berkeley. She has an overall GPA of 3.1 in her junior year.

In contrast, her cousin made headlines in his local newspaper with a perfect 1600 SAT score. Coincidentally, he too applied and was admitted to UC Berkeley College of Engineering the same semester. How does his performance compare to hers? He dropped out of college during his second semester and hasn't returned to any college.

My third point: The importance of motivation to learn is by far underscored in our school system. If children understand how learning applies to their lives, they will be motivated to be attentive in the grade school classroom and in high school. If kids at a young age see why learning applies to their lives and learn reasoning skills, they will have a better chance of being prepared for college. If there are assessment tools available to measure motivation to supplement academic testing, they could be useful.

Four: Parents are not adequately informed about the tests and their dates, even if they are actively involved in school organizations. One set of parents I spoke with complained that they did not know their student could

take the SAT in their freshman year while material was still fresh. And now I too realize I could have encouraged our daughters to be more prepared for the PSAT where valuable scholarships can be earned.

Five: Test scores are a source of stress. This is not a complaint, because, as you know, stress can be positive. But with other students who did not enjoy the high quality of education our girls had, the stress could be very negative and intimidating and possibly even be a reason for giving up early.

My last observation is one that's been discussed much today. Schools are too busy assigning kids into classes and do not counsel kids on admission requirements. Our daughter Ashley has become almost obsessed with entrance requirements of colleges and universities throughout the nation. She was inundated with marketing materials from private universities. She designed a filing system to keep all of them straight and became practically an expert on the required test scores, teacher-to-student ratios and other statistics important to her. She spent countless hours, mostly in the middle of the night when all of her other activities were done, studying the pros and cons of schools that offer her major of public policy. She's lucky to have the drive to do this. But of course, not all kids will go to this extreme. With access to a counselor who has expertise in college entrance requirements, all kids can have the same kind of information Ashley learned.

In summation, I think, as a taxpayer, our greatest investment in our future in the state of California is counselors, financial support for counselors.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you for really good practical information, and I'm glad this information has been gathered from the panelists because we need to follow up on the real-life experiences that you're having today. The life experiences that your daughters are having, and the

kind of situation that they're in. Because we always think we may know what's best, but you can tell us, and because you're living it.

Thank you very much.

Last, but not least, Paul Kanarek, President of The Princeton Review.

MR. PAUL KANAREK: Thank you. I want to say thank you to Jamillah and Allen because I know how hard you worked to put all this together and how often we spoke, and this room is a testimonial to your skills. And I was listening to you guys present, and for Carlos and Benigno, any college that rejected you because of your poor SAT scores is, I think, lacking today. And it is just remarkable listening to the two of you speak and as well spoken as you were, and I was amazed. And Karen, you I'm not worried about.

The first thing, Madam Chair, you asked a question of why are only 45 percent of the kids in California taking the SAT? There's actually a positive element to that, and that is our community college system is so phenomenal and the bang for our buck there is so incredible, and the access to the UC system is so tailored -- go to junior college for two years and then you can come to Berkeley without SAT requirements. And a very significant portion of our kids, for economic and numbers reasons, chooses what is, by far, the best community college system on the planet. And I think once you make that ascertation as a sophomore -- I don't have the economic means to pursue a UC curriculum, why take the SAT? Why spend the effort? Why spend the energy? Because we already know you have to be 18 to go to community college, done -- I think it's a testimonial to the superbness of that system as opposed to an indictment of what is going wrong within the schools. And I wanted to throw that out for you.

I coach kids for the SAT. In my early years that was a little to the left of being involved in prostitution, quite frankly. It was not a highly regarded activity. I can tell you this, coaching works.

I gave you the numbers, but since 1985 when we started Princeton Review in California, we've grown from about 500 students statewide to about 5,000, and that's because kids come in, their parents spend the money, the kids spend the time, and time is the student's currency, and all of a sudden their scores improve. It's not magic.

SENATOR HUGHES: What does it cost?

MR. KANAREK: About $600 to $700.

SENATOR HUGHES: That is beyond the means of many of my constituents.

MR. KANAREK: I completely concur. And Senator Hayden brought this up, which is we have this extraordinary gap between wealth and SAT scores. And Senator Hayden is approaching this from the perspective of, "What can we do in terms of vouchering? What can we do to make the coaching accessible to the kids?" That's backwards. What we need to look at is the test themselves and say, "How are we using these instruments?" Such that so many people feel the need to take the tests. And if we go ahead and we take these SATs and the ACTs and designate them to the trash heap of UC history, then we don't have coaching being a concern. Then we don't have money being thrown at the problem being of concern.

I think what we have here is that for ten years Berkeley has stood up and said, "This is the formula that is required to be admitted to our school," and 50 percent of that was grades, and 50 percent of that was fill in the bubbles, and your constituents have heard. And they have said, and they have voted with their pocketbooks, "I must give my kid this opportunity."

And for many people that $700 hurts a lot. But they've got to do it because the system is set up that says, "You must do this to give your kid a chance at one of the greatest educational systems in the world."

SENATOR HUGHES: But cannot the public schools give them this? Is it not within their capabilities? We're spending lots more money in public education than we realize, and why is it that our public education system isn't doing it? Are they not putting the right emphasis in the right place?

MR. KANAREK: Is that not kind of a situation where you have the tail wagging the dog? Do we want our curriculum to be driven by the ability to fill in bubbles? I mean, the PSAT and the SAT -- and you may not know this, Senator -- the SAT math covers arithmetic, Algebra I and basic geometry, that's it. The more advanced you are mathematically, the more the SAT punishes you. If you're in calculus, you haven't seen half of the stuff on that test since pterodactyls roamed the earth. I mean, it's a complete disparity between what you know and what you don't know. Class size is an issue. Lack of knowledge of the material is an issue. And certainly, we've heard all of us complain about the fact that it would be great to actually invest more money in the counselors than in these silly fill-in-the-bubble exams.

And so after sitting here and listening to this, what is a fascinating discourse, I wanted to let you know my feelings, which are if we would simply de-emphasize the use of the test in UC admissions, then I think you would see a lot of the disparity between coaching and SAT scores go away. If you don't have to take the SAT to go to Berkeley, you don't have to take The Princeton Review. And I'm here as the owner of The Princeton Review telling you this. When the guy who makes his living off the SAT gets up in front of

you and says, "This is a seriously flawed instrument," I am probably one you should listen to.

You see, I've had more experiences of Benigno and Carlos than I have with Karen. I have seen kids every single day get up and they feel they're stupid because they couldn't fill in bubbles. And they look at their ability to fill in bubbles and all of a sudden it gets rid of all the good feelings about school, and that drives me nuts. I'm there often the day the kids get their PSAT scores back and they get them back en masse and they're all the same. They all grab their tests and they hide them from mom and dad and they do this. (Demonstration) And you can always tell the ones who have done well because they're like, "What did you get?" It's an ego contest. And so you've got some kids who feel good, and you get some kids who feel lousy.

Why am I doing this? I woke up this morning and I was kind of intimidated and I was kind of scared because I was coming up to the California State Senate, and then I realized that this morning you kind of kicked the dog and fell over the cat, which is kind of what I did. And so I wanted to bring forth what I believe to be true about these tests. I know that a kid who got a 1400 from Lowell who took Princeton Review is absolutely no different from the kid who scored 1200 who goes to Chula Vista. One could afford prep, one could not. They are the same creature, and yet the UC system treats them as two entirely different entities, and that's what drives me nuts.

The SAT, frankly, and the ACT, they're frankly decent instruments when used as a wide paintbrush. But when we use them as a really finite tool, that's when we're kind of misusing the test. And the UC system often violates ETS's own guidelines for the use of that tests. Ten points can make a difference as to whether you get a paid scholarship or whether you get to play

sports in school. 1400 versus 1390 takes you out of half the regional scholarships. The National Merit Scholarship Foundation, which is the largest scholarship program that we have, is based exclusively upon the ability to fill in bubbles. One point makes a difference. That when we look at the UC Eligibility Index, ten points is yes or no where they get to go. And then on top of it all, on one side we go ahead and we say, "SAT scores are not important, grades are," and on the other side, if you look within the UC booklet, all of a sudden I can get into the UC system based upon standardized tests alone. That's a confusing message.

If we're going ahead and telling kids, "No, it's grades, it's grades, it's grades, and test scores are these little things on the side," that should never be in there. And one of the things I would strongly urge you to do, because it sends a powerful message to the community, eliminate the ability to get into UC schools based exclusively upon standardized tests. It is a misuse and abuse of the process.

ACT versus SAT: SAT has done a wonderful job marketing in the California region. Everyone thinks about the SAT. Even you guys are part of this. You talk about PSAT, SAT and, incidentally, ACT. ACT is a different kind of exam. If you're wonderful at English and horrible at math, ACT is better. If you're part of a parochial school education and you've had kind of the chalk-and-talk experience, ACT is usually a better test. Most kids should take both. And the fact of the matter is, in my 14 years in Princeton Review, I have never coached a kid for the ACT because no one has ever asked. It's kind of out of sight, out of mind. And then you have the parent organization, the people who run ACT, they're kind of warm, they're fuzzy, they're decent. And then the people who run the SAT, which is the Educational Testing

Service, that's about as arrogant and difficult an organization as I've ever run into. That's not College Board.

SENATOR HUGHES: No fights, please.

MR. KARANEK: That's not the College Board, which I have a tremendous respect for, but ETS and ACT have totally different ways of dealing with the kids that they service. And so I would love us to get out into the community and tell them that SAT and ACT are both viable options.

The ethnic distribution in Princeton Review, it's about 60 percent Asian American, it's about 36 percent white, it's about 3 percent Hispanic, and it's less than 1 percent African American. And so you can see it's very much in line of what we're talking about.

And finally, as I kind of wrap up -- did all of you get a chance to get this? *Get an Edge on the SAT* ? Did that get handed to you?

SENATOR HUGHES: Yes.

MR. KARANEK: I will leave you with the following -- let's have a little fun here. Turn to the back page. We're going to do math, guys.

First of all, the joy of a multiple choice exam. What is the capital of Malawi? I have absolutely no idea. So I give you five answer choices: Washington, D.C., Paris, Tokyo, London or Lilongwe. Gee, it's Lilongwe, not because I have the knowledge but because I have the ability to tell you what it is not. And this is the joy of a multiple choice exam. All of the correct answers are already on the page. All you have to do is find the one that's right.

Now, the first question down there is world famous, it's called the "donut problem." And it appeared on a SAT 10 years ago, and I wanted to show you this so you understand that what I am teaching in my classes has very little to do with math and very little to do with English and a lot to do

with how to fill in bubbles. In the figure above, what is the greatest number of non-overlapping regions into which the shaded region can be divided with exactly two straight lines? Here's the first problem: Humans do not talk to each other in this fashion. This is a word problem. We loathe word problems. I don't know about you guys. When was the last time you ran into one of your associates and said, "Good morning. How are your non-overlapping regions today?" People don't converse in this fashion.

So I go ahead and I teach my kids you've got two lines. Think of this as a bagel, a donut, there's a hole in the middle. And with two cuts of the knife split the thing into as many pieces as you can. There you go, I got four. But I teach my kids that this is question number 25, and question number 25 on the SAT is the hardest question on the test, and if you could find the answer that easily, if you felt no pain, no anguish, it has no chance of being correct. So all Princeton Review kids get rid of number four. Although they love it, although it's perfectly obvious, it is too obvious for its place within the exam.

Next, what is the greatest number? Well, if they ask you for the greatest number, you certainly are not going to give them the greatest number; so six is gone. And the reason why is I know that less than five percent of the country got this question right. So anything obvious or ordinary, my kids are not allowed to do.

Now, I got four pieces. I want the greatest number, I got four pieces, it's bigger than three, it's bigger than two, and so my kids get the answer right: five. Mathematically -- (demonstration) -- there it is. One, two, three, four, five. And it used tangent line theory which they learn about the first 20 minutes of geometry. My question is this: Is that math? No. What that is, it's a skill that you need to learn to do better on the SAT.

That, gentlemen, without that skill, is one of the reasons the test drove you into the ground. It has so little to do with how smart you are and so much to do with how well you fill in the bubbles. And that's why I'm here today. I want you to have this kind of visceral experience so you understand.

Thanks a lot.

SENATOR HUGHES: Quite a show. Yes, Carlos.

MR. JACKSON: I would like to make one comment on behalf of the students. I think a lot of the reason we're here today is Prop. 13. This is dealing with a lot of access issues. If we had a better K-12 education, if we had more money to give to that through increased property taxes by repealing Prop. 13, we may not be here in this situation today.

Thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you very much.

All right. Now moving right along we have another panel on our agenda that has to leave to catch a plane. It's very appropriate now to talk about "Alternative Strategies to Student Assessment."

Eugene E. Garcia, Latino Eligibility Task Force; Glen Singleton, Executive Director of Pacific Education Group; and Andrea Buechel, Managing Director of Pacific Education Group.

We'll hear from Eugene Garcia, please.

MR. EUGENE GARCIA: Thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be here. I'm Eugene Garcia. I'm Dean of the Graduate School of Education at UC Berkeley and have the privilege of chairing the Latino Eligibility Task Force, which was a task force created by the University of California Office of the President, and it was asked to take a look at issues that related to low eligibility of Latino students in the state of California, particularly as it relates to the University of California.

The reason we're here today, in discussion of standardized tests and particularly the SAT, is that one of our recommendations, after three or four years of work on issues related broadly to eligibility of Latinos in the state of California, did have to do with the use of standardized tests and, more specifically, the SAT.

Senator Hughes, you've already pointed out that very directly the SAT, if we use it, continue to use it, as a determiner of eligibility, not of admissions, eliminates essentially 60 percent of students who are potentially eligible; that is, who in fact meet all the other requirements, but just do not take the SAT. For that reason alone, we feel that elimination of the SAT as related to eligibility is an important issue that needs to be considered by the University of California and it is doing that now.

We also would encourage campuses to use admissions beyond the eligibility issue -- to use other admissions procedures which minimize or even do not require the SAT. We are not anti-testers or anti-SAT generally, but we believe that there may be some added value to use of standardized tests and SAT, but at present for Latino students, that does not seem to be the case.

In addition, we also recommended the use of college community transfer as a way to achieve more Latino participation in the UC. Again, the SAT is not required for students to move on to the community colleges and then transfer to the university.

I want to just speak to some issues I've laid before you. One particular chart, the first chart, which dramatically shows the number of students that we essentially are removing from the eligibility category so that over a period of some 10 to 12 years, as the Latino student high school rate increases by about 8 to 9 percent per year, we would effectively eliminate between now and 2005, some 30,000 -- 30,000 Latino students who have met all of the

requirements to come to the University of California except they did not take the SAT I or SAT II.

So we believe that this is a real policy issue as that set of students increases. I'm not just talking the number of students in the K-12 sector, I'm talking about high school graduates; that we would be eliminating a very effective part of those students who are doing very well in those high schools; that is; achieving that 3.3 GPA in A to F courses.

We're very concerned about that and concerned about the SAT, and I want to just briefly touch on a couple of reasons, or several reasons why that's the case. We do think there are some biases in the SAT. Not so far to indicate that there might be cultural biases, but we are concerned about the linguistic bias. Many Latinos in the state essentially learn English as a primary language, as does many Asian Americans in this state learn Chinese and other languages other than English as their first language. The data suggests that these students do poorly on the English verbal part of the SAT I. This clearly suggests a bias related to access to English, not necessarily access to material related in their schooling participation.

We also know, through our recent studies, that high school GPA does not significantly correlate with the SAT scores. So that is an important ingredient in our own recent work, independent of the UC Office of the President's analysis of this issue. We also realize that the SES of students essentially is related. We don't need the SAT to tell us that low income students do not do well in academic areas, including standardized tests or other tests of academic achievement, including performance in classes as measured by the GPA.

Moreover, we're deeply concerned essentially that the SAT is used to cull students, not to give them the opportunity to come to the University of

California, which, by the way, was the original intent of the SAT, was to try to give those students who did not do well in their courses, to give them an alternative way to demonstrate their ability to do well in the academic area. We think presently it's just primarily a culling device, particularly for Latino students.

More importantly, I think we're deeply concerned about how the SAT does not predict a success in college for particularly Latino students over a longer period of time. So for instance, our own analysis of the UC, we found no significant difference between Latino students and white students, even though there were differences in SAT scores, in their persistence. That is, are they still in school after two years? Nor did we find a significant difference in graduation rates. Do they actually finish? So even though the SAT is highly correlated with freshman GPA, there is no evidence to suggest in the UC or otherwise that it is correlated or predictive of success at the University of California, either persistence or graduation. That, we think, is a real problem in using then the SAT in determining who comes essentially to the University of California.

We think also the SAT ignores systemic areas of educational opportunity which many of the previous speakers have spoken to, whether or not students get access to learning mathematics and other reasoning skills -- what we call higher order skills -- which the SAT does in fact attempt to access. Many of our students, particularly Latino students, do not get access. There's a number of excellent research reports available to show essentially the unfortunate existence of tracking many students not served well. Our recent work suggests that in ten high schools that we studied that were predominantly Latino populated, there were much fewer honors courses available, much fewer A-F courses available, and much fewer AP courses

available. So these are the kinds of opportunities that certainly work against someone doing well on the SAT. It also works against them doing well in college. But those issues are not essentially addressed in the SAT.

You've already dealt very effectively with the issue of coaching. And we do know, and we do see studies, in all due respect to our colleague from the College Board, that we do see and have evidence that suggests that you can increase scores, as our previous speaker said. Yet, parents are asked to at least provide a $700 minimum, $600 to $700 minimum. Some parents spend as much as $2,100 on getting their students ready for the SAT. We think that is a real problem for Latino parents when the medium family income of Latino parents in California is significantly below the mean and does not provide the opportunity for those parents to take this particular opportunity for -- or provide this opportunity for their students.

We also have learned from our own studies of students in high schools, as well as research done not only in California but in Michigan, that students who essentially perceive themselves as not being able to do well on these tests essentially don't do well on them. So there is this notion of student perception and perspectives. Many first generation, as our counselor indicated, students don't have access to previous understandings of the importance and significance of tests nor how they might do on those tests.

This data, our data, and other data suggests that this, in fact, leads to two things: One, they do poorly on the test when they take them. And secondly, they don't take them. They just refuse. They won't do it. And in fact, we found in the schools we studied less than 20 percent of the students in those schools. One of the counselors said 30 percent in her school. We found in Latino predominant high schools, less than 20 percent take the SAT. When asked in our studies why they didn't take the SAT, they essentially

said they were either afraid of it, felt they couldn't do well on it, and didn't think they needed it because they could go on to the community college.

All this has to do with the issues you have already raised of making sure that students understand what it takes to go on to college. None of this data suggests the SAT adds much value.

Just to assure you, there are other universities around this country who use other admission standards and do not use the SAT at all. So it's not the case that the University of California needs to stand out if it decides not to use the SAT, and those students seem to do well in those universities. I'll just point to the CSU that does not require the SAT, and you don't see a whole bunch of students failing in the CSU because it's directly related to the SAT, not any more than fail at the University of California.

Let me talk about alternatives. That's really the text of your request to us. We first suggest that the SAT itself is not a very direct achievement test that's aligned with curriculum and the standards that, in fact, drive the curriculum and instruction in our schools in California. We would much rather see achievement tests which are aligned with the California curriculum to be much better indicators of how, in fact, students are able to handle what they're essentially asked to handle in their courses. And that those might in fact, if we insist on using achievement tests, or using standardized tests, that those kinds of tests might be better in terms of helping us make some decisions about who comes to the University of California.

Very specifically, the Golden State exa· ı is now being developed. This is a standards-based exam on California standards, for California students, for California schools. The SAT is not based on California standards or California schools. That's one of the reasons why my colleague from the

College Board could say it's not a good reason to use it for accountability purposes. It's not a good reason to use it for ways in which we understand how our schools are in fact preparing students. What we ought to do is use an assessment that is directly aligned with the kind teachers we prepare, the kind of curriculum we use, the kind of instruction we provide. That does generate an achievement test. It does generate a standardized achievement test and that is what we would essentially suggest.

We would also suggest a potential combination of GPA and a standardized achievement test based on California State standards. We think taking the top four percent of students in California takes no risk in dealing with really trying to grapple with the very best who have dealt with the curriculum which have been put before them. And also allowing scores on standardized tests, which are standards based, to be used as well. So we're not at all suggesting here that standardized achievement tests ought to be thrown away, we just suggest that they be aligned with the California curriculum, and in fact, the GPA take on a heavier stress than standardized achievement tests. Right now they're taking on an even merit.

In summary, we don't prepare students to take tests. We should never prepare students to take tests. We should prepare students for the challenge of the work and for succeeding in college.

Our own data with regard to Latino students, and specifically the SAT, suggest that the SAT adds no value with regard to achieving that goal. It just doesn't. Instead we would suggest that the SAT performs a negative gatekeeping role for Latino students, at least as it relates to the UC as it is presently used.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR MCPHERSON: Thank you. Do you know of any other states that are using some of the programs or variations? I know you were talking about California sticking with what's here in California, but states that have made adjustments like some of which you have talked about? And some of the results, have they been measured yet?

MR. KARANEK: Well, Texas certainly has gone into a mode of using GPA and the top 10 percent of their students to go on without respect to a standardized achievement. But Texas has also developed the Texas Assessment System, which is a standardized achievement test, which is aligned with a set of standards and goals that the teachers essentially teach too. But all the teachers in Texas do that, and so when students do well on that test, it is a fair measure of how those students do on what's important to Texas, basically, as opposed to what might be important to folks who developed the SAT.

SENATOR MCPHERSON: Some of the Latino students, in particular, that you were mentioning often, what would be a driving force for them to become interested? The parents? I mean, would it be the economic future that you have? I think there have been studies by CPEC and some other organizations that, if you graduate from high school, you're going to make a million dollars more than somebody who doesn't, and it gets better and better as you go to community college and so forth. But is it economic drive as much as anything? What do you think?

MR. KARANEK: In our work in the 10 high schools which are predominantly Latino, we did do some surveys with students. We didn't do surveys with parents, but we asked students why they might want to go on to college.

First of all, most of them said they would like to go on to college. You would think that since only about 38 percent of them do go on to college, at least a four-year institution, about 40 percent go on to a combination some time in their career of two-year and four-year, that you'd say, "Well, maybe the other 60 percent doesn't want to go on to college." Almost everybody said they would like, at one time in their next opportunity, to go on to college. They see the link between education and, essentially, economic security. And that's essentially true. Now again, we didn't ask the parents, we asked the kids. Unfortunately, most of them do not go on to college and most of them who go on to community college do not transfer to the four-year institutions, particularly the UC. I can't speak for the CSU, but the UC.

So yes, I would have to answer your question, at least from the students' perspective, they do see a link between economic security and education.

SENATOR MCPHERSON: Okay. Thank you. I'm not sure which one of you would like to go next.

MR. GLEN SINGLETON: I'll start. My name is Glen Singleton, and I thank the Senate Committee for having me and my colleague, Andrea Buechel, here.

I just want to say, first, that the organization that I founded and preside over actually serves two functions. One function is to work as an agent of school change to help schools reform in ways that impact the learning of all students, particularly students who tend to be underserved by the current structure. The other half of the organization works with students who are in the pipeline right now around traditional ways of gaining access and opportunities in higher education. So we too serve as a test preparation service, and on that side of our business, our clientele is predominantly high

income. We're located in Palo Alto. We tend to do a service for families in helping them not only understand the opportunities in higher education, but also to perform better on the standardized measures that we're talking about.

I think our role today, though, is to speak to the alternative and really to give some example of what Dr. Garcia is talking about in terms of a standard Bates curriculum, a more authentic assessment, and an accountability system that helps improve some of the pieces around equity. I also like to say that my SAT scores were under 1000. So it is interesting to me how these scores play out. As a former admissions director at the University of Pennsylvania, in 1992 I left the office, and I noticed at that time, and I continue to notice in my work now, that there is an increasing importance on these tests. For us, at a school where the application pool continued to get larger, and it continues to get larger, the standardized test became a de facto rejection tool rather than admission tool.

And finally, we used the Predictive Index, and that was our indication, using the testing as well as the grade point average, to determine whether a kid would do well or not do well in that first semester for our institution of their performance. My Predictive Index for the University of Pennsylvania was a 1.8. That was to be my grade point average. Should you have told my mom that at that time, I doubt she would have spent any money for me to go to Penn. At the same time, the Predictive Index for students of color and first generation college students who usually happen to be poor is much lower, and at the same time, these students are admitted to the university and, in many cases, they succeed. We expected a higher Predictive Index from students who come from suburban schools. And that is because of the proliferation of test prep in those areas and the higher test scores that generally come from those areas.

Having said all this about testing, I think that a discussion that looks only at testing and not at pedagogy and not at schooling will get at a solution that perhaps is an essential solution but not a sufficient solution. What we look at are issues of equity, and particularly among the African American and Latino students and their performance. We look at their opportunities to access rigorous curriculum, their support around that access. Then we look at their acceleration patterns in that curriculum and we look beyond whether they just get into college, but it's more important whether they're going to be able to sustain performance once they're there. So in many cases we're looking at measures that determine really whether students are ready. And probably the primary function for that would be the experience that they have in the four years of high school.

So before I go into that, Andrea comes from a college that actually made optional the SAT, and I think what Bates did would probably be illustrative for the committee.

MS. ANDREA BUECHEL: Thank you for having me here as well.

I will refer to Bates as sort of a case study, recognizing of course that a small liberal arts college in Maine is quite different from a state university system in California. However, I think so many of the questions that Bates posed in 1984, in considering this policy, are similar to the ones that you have raised here: What kind of students are we excluding? What are we measuring? What do these mean? Any number of sort of the philosophical questions, along with some of the practical ones. And Bates philosophically believed that students should be able to present their strengths without a three-hour test on a Saturday morning determining that. We know that for some students it does predict how they perform, but what we found is that that was not the case in terms of their GPA performance at a small college.

So the initial concerns reflected -- some of the ones we may have heard here as well -- including, "Well, we'll just scare off the good students when we have a deluge of unprepared students applying to Bates." And neither of these were true. In fact, our hope, and what we found to be true, was that the number of students who might otherwise not have considered a competitive liberal arts college did in fact apply. Most of those were young women, students of color, working-class families, first generation students. And those numbers did increase with the optional policy, even though some of them did end up using the submission policy.

And what we found is that tracking those students -- and at this point they were still required to turn in their achievement tests, which are now called SAT II, the subject tests, because we did want to make sure there was still some standardization. But the first wave of the nonsubmission policy found that after four years there was a difference of .05 in the GPA between submitters and nonsubmitters, despite what we found with internal numbers, a difference of 160 points in their original SAT scores. So clearly, they were able to perform as well as their colleagues.

Part of the process at Bates is more comprehensive than some of the larger universities can be. There is a significant amount of writing, more recommendations, and an interview is strongly recommended, and over 90 percent of the students who apply do have an interview. So there are a number of other variables that are allowed to help predict a student's achievement at college.

In 1990, Bates decided to make all testing optional. So students were no longer required to submit the achievement -- the now SAT II, and we have found the same thing. They're currently still working on the most recent study, but again, it's clear that students can be successful in a competitive

liberal arts college setting despite what they consider, and others might as well, poor SAT scores.

So Bates will continue this policy. Unfortunately, it is a very labor-intensive process, and when you have only 4,000 applications that are read, three, four, five times, that's not a realistic extrapolation that we can make to the university system. But I do want to suggest that it is possible to evaluate without the presence of standardized testing.

MR. SINGLETON: So one of the things that we're looking at is how might we go about making some of the more readily available information mean more to the colleges and university. Essentially you look at a standardized test that's come into effect because we're afraid of holding really important what that transcript says, and our ability to make some meaning of it. And I just want to put up a couple of examples that will help us, just to familiarize you with the current California high school transcript.

Admissions is asked to make a lot of sense out of this, and many of the things that they have to draw from it are inferences that aren't true. In fact, it says that "a student spent time in courses," and it says that "a student received these grades."

My work, as a part of the largest, I guess, restructuring activity in the state, Senate Bill 1274, one thing that we learned is that the most important thing that we can do is listen to the voice of the students, and that's what we heard today. I would wager that all three of those students should be admitted to the university. However, if we're not careful, we're going to lose a couple of them. And that's the problem. That's where we sit right now. I would imagine that the student with the 1600 has a transcript that looks like this. So we get evidence from this transcript for this student that it works.

And the point is, I guess, that in California with a diverse student body, I'm not sure that we can find one way to deal with all of our students. So perhaps we should be looking at not only what we do with a test, but we should be looking more generally at testing, and we should be looking at schooling and testing as a way of getting at these issues of equity.

So we approach this from what we call the Transitions Project and that is a way of helping schools to make more meaningful the most important information that they can give. Most colleges will say that the most important information is the transcript. But if I can look at this transcript and say most high schools are suffering from grade inflation, many grades are socially constructed rather than scientifically constructed; that is to say there's a lot of emotion involved in the grading process. And just because a kid sits in an honors class, as it's called, does not mean that there's rigorous work taking place there.

And we see this play out when students go to college. Often you admit a proliferation of 4.0 students and you don't get a proliferation of 4.0 work once you get there. So we designed a project that would help the transcript to become more meaningful. It is in fact, as Dr. Garcia said, a project that looks at California standards. It's a standards-driven performance assessment project with four goals. The first goal is to first begin talking about this juncture, this intersection between high schools and the university. There's an assumption that these two units are working together because there's talk between them. But in fact, the high school very much needs the university in terms of constructing curriculum and assessment. And the university needs to be closer to the high school in terms of really understanding the experience of students.

Advocacy. What we heard from our students is some students, no one talks to them about college. So there's an assumption for students that you are suppose to know how to do this process. And in fact, much of the college admissions process is all about the knowledge of how to navigate one juncture to the next: what to do, when to do it, how to do it.

The third piece is equity, and that is explicitly saying that we should not be satisfied with the fact that we don't have proportionate enrollment in college among our students of color and their white and Asian counterparts. So this project looks precisely at that -- the fact that particularly Latino students and Black students are not gaining access to rigorous course work, not gaining support to stay in that course work if they do get into it, and then still don't have the feeling that they should go to college.

And then finally, standards -- standards, assessment, and an accountability system. What our schools first designed was clear standards. And that is to tell a student what we think is important. Schools don't do this. It's sort of a secret message that the kid has to figure out over the course of the year what matters most to that teacher. And often it's not what matters to the next teacher. So they go through school with varying descriptions and definitions of what's important here.

Now, when a kid comes into school who hasn't had a tradition from his family of positive experiences in school, they don't necessarily have an incentive to do well here, and particularly, many kids are there and the incentive is get the good grades, don't talk back to your teachers, and you get to go to college. Well, for many students this is foreign. So it's important that schools devise some standards and make them explicit to the students.

And then they are assessed on those standards. Not on the next student, which is a norm-base criteria, but on criteria base. That is, what is

it that students should know and be able to do? And that's what you see here, the standards of one school. There are five schools throughout the state. They're all different kinds of schools. One's a Chapter 1 inner-city school in San Diego, several are high performing suburban schools. They're all engaging in the same exercise.

What you end with is a reporting document. And it's very nice, in this case, that we're working with two systems here in the state of California that are quite supportive and have been incredibly helpful as colleagues to these schools. The University of California and Cal State have been working with the Transitions Project for the past five years. And together this is a co-construction of how we can talk about students in ways that are more based on their performance. So here you see a different kind of transcript which lists performance assessments based on criteria, based on a connection of new styled course work.

What I heard from the different students are different ways that the school has invited them to learn. This kind of project invites students to learn in all of those different ways.

If in fact we can say that kids are performing to criteria rather than "Johnny's just better than Janie," then in fact we can make better decisions in admission, and that's what this project aims to do.

SENATOR HUGHES: How do students get to know about your group? Or parents get to know about this group?

MR. SINGLETON: My organization, in fact, is pretty transparent to the clients. We are a consulting organization and we serve as consultants to major reform efforts in this state. So we are hired to support the work of the Annenburg funding, SB 1274, new ventures, that kind of thing.

So this project came out of SB 1274, the demonstration of restructuring in public education in the state of California. And this is an effort focused directly at the high schools. It's a collaboration of not only the university, both university systems and some high schools, but College Board is a partner in this organization, the Educational Testing Service, the Coalition of Essential Schools. All people who really need to see a different pattern and see more authentic work in high schools have come together.

Now, where does the SAT fit in on this? We have held still, unlike the eight-year study which this is modeled after, which happened in the late '20s, we've held still the SAT because of this kind of discussion that we're having. It's a very complex issue. But there's a deep-seated belief that a standardized test measure is important in an authentic assessment design, a standardized test measure.

I think our problem here in California is we pretty much use one standardized test measure. And if in fact we were able to provide a multitude of opportunities for kids, including the Golden State Exam, including the SAT, the ACT, and perhaps even a performance-base test that's designed, then we have a chance of gaining that standardized indicator which colleges do need to understand who's coming in; but also giving kids a chance to express their talents and their interests in the format that's least biased in terms of their way of learning, their style of learning.

SENATOR HUGHES: Any further questions?

SENATOR MCPHERSON: I think to summarize, one size doesn't fit all. I mean, it's very basic and that's what we're trying to do. And I think that your comment about some of these tests are a de facto rejection tool rather than an admission tool is kind of bothersome. I don't know if we're

going in the right direction. Maybe we need to turn this ship 180 degrees and head it in another direction.

MR. SINGLETON: I think it's very important to connect with that point. It serves as a rejection tool because so many kids are appearing qualified, and that gets to the school. I remember reading files at the university -- University of Pennsylvania -- and I would call like an Irvine High School or a University High School, these high performing learning communities, and I would say, "You know, you've got 20 kids that are listed as the Valedictorian, how can it be?" You know, "You have 14 kids here who have 4.7 GPAs, how can it be?" At some point these grades become so socially constructed that higher education feels the need to find a measure that will help them decipher through what's going on.

And so in some ways, as the Princeton Review gentleman said, you really up the ante if we don't address schooling. You know, you really up the ante by getting rid of this test today. You're still going to have the problem of inequity in terms of what kids know and are able to do. Right now, people are able to alter that based on socioeconomic status. If Princeton Review decides in a good year they're going to do more pro bono work, then you have more Black and brown kids who have higher test scores. The problem is still there, because with those higher test scores, something that we're hearing here, with the higher test scores it doesn't mean that you're going to be able to stay in the university.

So admission then is only one part of this piece also. And certainly it's essential that we have these conversations and we think of other ways of expanding the standardized test format, but it's not sufficient in terms of getting at real issues of equity. We have to talk about the fact that as a kid walks into the classroom, the teacher standing there has to see that kid as a

learner and not bring with them all of the biases that we, as adults, do. So whether that kid has test prep or not, that Black and brown kid needs to be able to have rigorous, qualified instruction in a setting that really supports their learning and the kid has to believe that, "Yes, I'm a learner, and yes, I can go to college, and yes, I can do well."

SENATOR HUGHES: The same way that the institutions support those students that get the athletic scholarships.

MR. SINGLETON: Absolutely. An interesting question for Karen down here would have been -- I heard of wonderful things in this school. I want to know if they're for all kids. And this is the problem here. It's not that that doesn't exist. It's just the fact that it has to exist for all kids, and it's a real shifting paradigm. In California we're comfortable with kids reading 50 novels as they graduate from high school. At the same time, we have a growing population that can't read one. That's an equity issue and that's not about the SAT.

SENATOR HUGHES: That's true.

All right, thank you very much.

Our next group is the University of California. Carla Ferri, Director of Undergraduate Admissions. Keith Widaman, Chair of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools. And Patrick Hayashi, Associate Vice-Chancellor.

Carla Ferri.

MS. CARLA FERRI: Yes. Thank you, Senator Hughes, for inviting me to participate in this very important discussion today. I want to ensure that I let you know that we, at the university, appreciate very much what you're doing in this area. It's extremely important to us -- a continuing

discussion on issues that deal with access and equitable educational opportunities for all students in the state of California.

What you have asked me to do today is to actually focus on a factual review and presentation of how we use standardized tests in admissions at the University of California, and I will do just that.

I have passed to you and your committee a copy of my remarks so that you can have them as part of your additional review as you go on with the work of your Select Committee.

What I will do today, as I've said, is a factual overview that will focus both on how we use standardized tests in eligibility determination for the University of California, and also on how we use standardized tests in the selection process at the campuses of the university. Although, this latter component will be addressed more specifically by my colleague, Pat Hayashi, Associate Vice-Chancellor at UC Berkeley.

Before I go actually in a description of how we use standardized tests at UC, I want to re-emphasize something that was actually said at the very beginning by Warren Fox and Jean Ludwig of CPEC, and that is I want to emphasize for you what is the purpose of eligibility criteria for the University of California.

The eligibility criteria for UC, first of all, are an expression of what the university believes students must achieve in high school in order to be prepared to do university level work. But in the context of the Master Plan, and that is what Warren Fox and Jean Ludwig underlined for you, they also serve another fundamental purpose, and that is they define who will be in the 12.5 percent of the high school graduates in the state. So this is a mandate of the Master Plan for higher education, a mandate that the university has adopted as university policy, as you know, and we take this mandate very

seriously. So every time that we do look at our requirement, we discuss our requirement, we change our requirements, we need to take a look at how, whatever we want to do, matches against the benchmark of the 12.5 percent. So I wanted to make sure that this concept was not lost in the whole discussion of eligibility in admissions that you see.

Another thing that I want to emphasize again, before I go over the requirements of standardized tests, is that standardized tests at the University of California are not used by themselves as a single criterion or the primary criterion for admission, both for eligibility and for selectivity at the university. We use the test in combination with other indices of academic achievement and potential, such as grade point average and course work completed, as well as talents and other things that the student might have achieved.

Now, let me go over a very brief description of how we use test scores, standardized test scores, in the determination of UC eligibility.

First of all, to become eligible as a freshman, students must complete three distinct criteria: the scholarship requirement, the subject requirement and the examination requirement. The subject requirement calls for completion of a certain amount of course work in high school. The scholarship requirement calculates grade point average on those courses. And then we have an examination requirement. And the examination requirement calls for completion of the SAT I or the ACT. We have a choice there. We give students a choice, a clear choice there. And also, we require students to take three SAT II tests -- subject tests -- one in writing, one in math, and one of the choosing of the students.

When both ACT and SAT are presented, because this is a clear choice that we give students, which is not clearly understood by people in the state

of California, including, I must say, our counselors, we use the best of the two. Again, to make sure that we use whatever better means of identified achievement is available to us.

Also, for students that have a high school GPA that falls between 2.82 and 3.29, students also need to achieve a specific score on the SAT I or the ACT. For example, a person who has a 3.0 GPA in the high school record, they need to achieve 1270 on the SAT or 28 on the ACT.

For this particular group of students, the SAT may be a helpful tool to achieve eligibility, although the majority of the students achieve eligibility on a 3.3 or above for which the test scores are not relevant. For this band of students in the 2.82 and the 3.29, the SAT does become an important, useful tool to achieve eligibility.

There is also another path to UC eligibility for students, and although this has been described before as probably not an appropriate use of the test scores, I think I want to emphasize for you why we use this other path. It's a path that is used very seldom, very few people are achieving eligibility that way, less than one percent, but it's an alternative for those students who, for a variety of reasons, have not been able to achieve a scholarship and the subject requirements that are required of them. Especially this is a very important alternative for students that have chosen, for a variety of reasons, alternative educational experiences, such as attending a school that is not a traditional school, not accredited, or maybe they have done home schooling. For these students the university always has afforded this alternative to show or demonstrate potential for success by examination alone. And in my handout you have the test scores' cutoff that students need to achieve eligibility that way.

There are also other uses of standardized tests to determine eligibility for admission. I'll go over it very quickly and give you only one example. We can use SAT II subject tests to clear deficiencies in high school records. And again, this is a useful tool for students who, for a variety of reasons, may have not done well in a couple of courses. Also, for students who have proficiency in another language, these students can take an achievement test, Subject II test, in a foreign language and satisfy the two years of foreign language of the university. For example, a student who has proficiency in Spanish could take an SAT II test and score 520 on it and be exempted from the requirement.

Now, just a few words in terms of when the test requirement was first introduced as a component of UC eligibility. The examination requirement was first introduced in the mid '60s and pretty much has stayed the same as we have it today. It was introduced then as the SAT and three achievement tests. Now the tests have been changed -- the name has been changed to SAT II subject tests. The tests were kept pretty much the same until 1979. At that time the university introduced the ACT as an alternative to the SAT I. And at that time also, we introduced the Eligibility Index.

Why did we introduce the ACT? We felt that that was an alternative that we needed to provide to students. It's an alternative that if students do feel that they might do better in that particular test, they should have the ability to actually take that as an alternative. Although, as you have heard today, still the students in California do tend to take the SAT. We have noticed a slight increase in the number of students that at least take both. As a matter of fact, if I look at data at the university of our enrolled freshmen, there's about 22 percent that take both the SAT and the ACT. So that's an alternative that is made available to them.

Now, this is all that we do in terms of UC eligibility. We also use standardized tests in the selection of students for admission at the campus level, and certainly I'll defer to Pat Hayashi to express to you how they do this. However, I want to emphasize a very important point about the use of standardized tests in selection. They are only one of 13 factors that the university takes into consideration when evaluating the records of students for admission at a specific campus. They are basically one of nine, and they are not just a single factor that we use for admission selection.

One of the things that the university in its recent discussions about admissions following the Regents' resolutions about affirmative action, following the passing of Proposition 209, has been to emphasize the importance of doing a comprehensive assessment of the background of the student both in terms of academic background as well as personal achievement and talent. So just again, to re-emphasize, this is the direction that we are moving. This is what our campuses are doing to move to a very comprehensive assessment, not to just focus on a number that is related to us by a SAT or SAT II test, or ACT, but a very comprehensive review of all of these things that the student is presenting to us.

I will then pass the baton to Keith Widaman and then Pat Hayashi.

DR. KEITH WIDAMAN: I'd like to thank you for the invitation to attend today's hearing and provide information on the SAT. Before I begin with my remarks, I would like to talk about two things that have come up. One of them is contained later on here but they have been highlighted so far. One was the fact that only 45 percent of graduating seniors in California take the SAT. Prior to the gentleman from Princeton Review's comments, I was going to make the same comment. At this point, the University of California

is to select from the top one-eighth of the graduating seniors, the CSU system from the top 33 percent.

Technically speaking, the CSU system does require the SAT or ACT for certain of its students. If students score above 3.0 -- if they have a grade point average above 3.0, they don't have to take the SAT, but if they have a GPA between 3.0 and 2.0, they must have corresponding scores on the SAT or ACT. So they are required. I'm not sure exactly what proportion of CSU students that is, but even if it were all of them, what that means is that for students from public high schools who attend public colleges or universities in our state, at most one-third of them would have to take the SAT. So in some ways, if 45 percent of them do take it, that's a rather high number because the other two-thirds of them, the other 67 percent, community colleges are their route to higher education. So 45 percent is not bad.

A second thing deals with coaching. I would not be surprised if I sat here and listened to people from ETS say that coaching did not have much effect. Neither would I be surprised if someone from The Princeton Review or the Kaplan Agency were to come and say that coaching does marvelous things; it works. I read some of the newspaper articles contained in the booklet for today's hearing. I think reporters can say whatever they want. They reported 100 point increases of students. What I did was I went to the literature. I did a quick literature review in preparation for the meeting today.

There have been four major meta-analyses of studies of coaching. Coaching basically does not work. In uncontrolled studies, it appears that coaching can lead to estimated 40 point increases in verbal or quantitative scores on the SAT. Those are in uncontrolled studies where you simply sit kids down, put them through training, have them take the SAT and then

compare their scores to national norms. But in controlled studies where you randomly assign students to conditions, some to coaching conditions and some not to be coached at all, the estimated effects of coaching are 10 points. That comes out in several meta-analyses -- 10 points. I wish Senator Hayden was still around. If some parents wish to spend $700 or $3,000 to get coaching for their children, that's fine. And yes, only certain parents will be able to afford that, but in fact, the scientific studies converge on a figure of 10 points for each test in coaching. It's not practically useful. Actually, there's a larger effect of simply taking the test again. About a 20 point change simply from taking the test again. That seems to be far more valuable than coaching ever has been.

Okay, now moving to my remarks. Because mine is a little bit long, I'm going to skip around and I will try to give you a summary rather than reading my report in total.

What you will see is that I have talked about the issues of eligibility and selection much in the same way that Carla Ferri has already. I would note that the current CPEC Eligibility Study shows that 11.1 percent of the spring '96 graduates are eligible for UC, using our current guidelines.

If you would turn to page 3 of my remarks, there's a section here called, "The SAT Test: What It Is, What It Is Not." There's some discussion of the SAT I and the SAT II. If you turn over to page 4, there's a paragraph starting in the middle of the page saying, "Is the SAT a perfect test?" The simple answer is, no. No test ever developed was, is, or will be perfect. Moreover, no indicator of any sort (except, perhaps, death and taxes) is perfect. High school GPA -- the primary predictor of UC student performance -- is not a perfect indicator either. High school GPA, as we heard only a few minutes ago, is influenced by a wide variety of courses. It's biased by a wide variety of

factors, such as course selection, teacher grading biases, differences across high schools in grading practices, haphazard events like parental divorce or parental death, and many, many other factors. As a result, high school GPA is not a perfect predictor of student academic achievement or student academic preparedness for college or university.

Is it a good index? Yes. Probably the best we have, despite falling far short of perfection. I would argue the case for the SAT is similar. It is a good index despite falling short of perfection.

The next section is, "SAT Scores: Do They Relate to Academic Criteria?" Two of the first questions that arise are whether SAT scores relate to academic criteria and whether these relations are the same across groups, whether it's gender groups or ethnic groups.

There then is a section beginning at the bottom of page 4 about relations with first-year university grade point average. This describes the results of a Validity Study at the University of California.

I won't bore you with the details, the details are there. I checked on the results this morning. For approximately 20,000 students at the University of California who comprised the sample, high school grades correlated with college grades .43. That's not stupendous but at least it's a benchmark.

The SAT test scores, verbal plus quantitative, correlated .38 -- almost as high. When you put the two together, the multiple correlation is almost .50, suggesting that close to 25 percent of college grade point average, first-year college grade point average, is explained by grades and test scores.

What is interesting is that the GPA is based on three or four years of work -- correlates .43. The SAT I is based on three hours of work and correlates .38. The statement that in general the SAT does not relate to academic criteria at the University of California is simply false.

Some may quibble with the fact that we're only explaining 23 to 25 percent of the variance of first-year GPA. The people who quibble with that are the people who are taking the "glass half empty" interpretation of the results. I tend toward the "glass half full." The sample on which those analyses are based is a highly restricted sample. Any time the students at UC are suppose to be the top one-eighth of the graduating seniors of the state selected from among that group, any time there is a restricted sample of subjects, correlational results will go down. So in fact, a multiple correlation of .48 to .50, which is routinely obtained in Validity Studies, is actually a highly respectable figure.

SENATOR HUGHES: What about the fact that the SAT would only sort of predict the first year's performance? Do you take that into consideration?

DR. WIDAMAN: I'm glad you asked that, because if you turn over to page 6, there's a statement here, "Relations with graduation rates." You have a copy of this in your materials, it's the last page of the handout.

Saul Geiser, at the UC Office of the President, obtained a set of data. It was all students -- over 19,000 -- who entered the University of California in the fall of 1989. He had those students -- high school grade point average, their SAT scores, and then whether or not they graduated within seven years -- graduated by spring of 1996. He reasoned that if they hadn't graduated by seven years they were unlikely to do so at a later date. In fact, of that sample of over 19,000 students, approximately 76 percent of them did, in fact, graduate.

The outcome variable in this case is just a dichotomous variable: Did you graduate or did you not? And the predictors are high school grade point average and SAT scores. Both of these were statistically significant. Now,

it's difficult with the logistic regression analyses to interpret certain indices. Both were highly significant statistically.

This table shows what effect SAT and high school GPA had on predicted graduation rates. This is a complex table. What I would suggest you do is look at the person who has a high school GPA of 2.8 -- that's the top row of the table. For every 100 point increase in the SAT test total score, going from 600 to 700 to 800, there's about a 3 to 4 percent increase in graduation rate. Going from 600 to 1600, there's a 23 point increase -- 23 percent increase in graduation rates. The SAT has considerable value.

Now hold SAT constant. Look at the student who has an SAT test of 600. Go down the first column. Every two-tenths of a grade point average going from 2.8 to 3.0 to 3.2 and so on, leads to about a 4 percent increase in expected graduation. What this shows is that two-tenths of a grade point average rise is about as informative as a 100 point increase on the SAT test. And this is information where the grades and SAT are being asked to predict a criterion that occurred up to seven years later.

Another aspect of the analyses to show the value of both high school grades and SAT scores in this particular analysis is the standardized regression weights. The standardized regression weight for high school grades was .17. The standardized regression weight for SAT scores was .13. Point one seven (.17) and .13 are not exactly equal, but it shows that the SAT was contributing almost as much as grades to the prediction of graduation rates.

SENATOR HUGHES: But it shows no accountability for the human factor of things that might happen in the student's life once they get away from their home environment, what may happen to the family structure, or anything like this. So you're doing it completely in a vacuum of a human

condition, and things happen to students once they leave home. Things happen to the student's family even though they may be attending the university in their home town. So that skews your numbers.

DR. WIDAMAN: That's probably why we don't have a multiple correlation between high school grades and test scores greater than .50 when we're predicting first-year grade point average. That's right.

SENATOR HUGHES: The major adjustment from high school to university.

DR. WIDAMAN: Predicting first-year grade point average is a difficult business. But it's also the case that this is a very restricted sample, and in any restricted sample correlations are going to decrease. The suggestion before, that all students in the state take the PSAT, I thought was a wonderful idea. What we would probably find is extremely strong correlations in that case if we looked at community college grades for those students. Then we'd have the whole range and the correlations would be much higher. I'd be much more satisfied.

If you turn to page 7, there's a side heading, "The SAT I and SAT II Tests: Their Effect on Eligibility."

I have a section there on "Effect on students in general." If you read down in the paragraph a little bit, the CPEC Eligibility Study says 11.1 percent of students -- graduating seniors -- currently meet our eligibility standards. Of that 11.1 percent, approximately 92 percent are essentially eligible by grades alone. They have grades of 3.3 or above and they have taken the SAT tests. What they received on the SAT test is not a factor in determining their eligibility. So in fact, in terms of determining basic eligibility, the SAT has almost no weight at all. There are about 8 percent of the students who are what we call "index" students. They have grades

between 3.29 and 2.82, and for those students they have to attain a certain corresponding SAT score. That's 8 percent of the students, and less than one half of one percent of the students who qualify for the university qualify on grades alone. So the vast majority of students who qualify for the university, the score they receive on the SAT test is not a factor.

More importantly, one might look at the bottom of the page. It says, "Effect on eligibility rates of underrepresented students." What we did was we took the CPEC eligibility data, and some of us suggested we ought to do away with the SAT. So we said, "What would happen if we did away with the SAT?" If we did away with the SAT, then all of the students who are currently "index eligible" would no longer be eligible. Students would have to have a grade point average of 3.3 or above. When we look at the students around the state, instead of 11.1 percent, that rate would soar to 18.7 percent. Yes, Latino eligibility would go from 3.8 to 6.9 percent; a dramatic rise. And for African Americans, it would go from 2.8 to 5.8. It would more than double. But only if eligibility around the state went to 18.7 percent.

The only simple and direct way of bringing us back in line with the Master Plan would be to raise the grade point average required for the university. We found that if you raised the necessary grade point average to 3.65, we would cut off 12.78 percent of the students around California. That's close in line with the Master Plan. If we did that, Latino eligibility would fall back to 3.99 percent, and African American eligibility would fall to 2.34 percent, even lower than it is now. Basically, if we discarded the SAT, Latino eligibility would be only marginally higher than the current rate, and African American eligibility would be marginally lower than the current rate. The basic conclusion of this analysis is that SAT tests are not a major hurdle for

Latino and African American students in attempting to gain eligibility for the University of California.

SENATOR HUGHES: It only is if they don't take it.

DR WIDAMAN: This is if we discard them completely.

SENATOR HUGHES: It only is if they don't take it.

DR. WIDAMAN: This analysis was if we throw out the SAT completely. And nobody has to take it. If nobody has to take it, the Latino and African American eligibility rates would be essentially unchanged from what they are now.

SENATOR HUGHES: Staff has a concern.

MR. ALLEN TENG: My comment is I don't think the Latino Eligibility Study recommended to get rid of the SAT as much as to make it optional. How do you factor in -- like the testimony that was given earlier and which said that at places where it's optional, only 25 percent of the people actually choose that option and those are typically--

DR. WIDAMAN: This is an analysis based on a scenario under which no one would choose that option. And if no one would choose that option, you would have eligibility rates that are essentially unchanged from what they are now. SATs are not a hurdle for those students. There are other factors that are. It's not the tests.

How about page 8, "SAT Scores: Are They Biased or Affected by Other Variables?" Bias against particular groups. Bias is a very difficult problem to deal with. Simply because different groups have different mean scores on a test does not mean they are biased. Women tend to be shorter than men. Is a ruler a biased instrument? In fact, in our validity studies at the University of California -- analyses that I have done as chair of BOARS -- we have found that almost the same regression weights come out when you look at

prediction of undergraduate grade point average for different groups. In fact, at the bottom of page 8, there's the statement that SAT scores slightly overpredict UC grade point average for underrepresented minorities. What we have found is overprediction here means that SAT scores predict that individuals from these groups will attain certain levels of UC GPA, but the students actually achieve slightly lower UC GPAs than was predicted. The degree of overprediction is not seriously large so we ignore that. But in fact, what this means is the SAT is actually something of a benefit for these underrepresented students. It's not a hindrance.

I then mention a study that Eugene Garcia graciously shared with me on a sample of 48 Latino students, and perhaps that's what he was talking about when he said that high school grades and SAT scores were unrelated and SAT scores were not related to college grades. I looked at the study and that's true. It's also true that for this study, high school grades, which we use as the primary predictor of college grades, were totally unrelated to college grades as well, leaving one little to on with regards to selection of students.

I then have a section on the effects of coaching or re-testing. And I mentioned several of the meta-analyses that have been done. One meta-analysis said that in carefully controlled studies that had a control group, which is a basic scientific requirement, one meta-analysis estimated that the effects of coaching were about 10 points on each of the two scales -- the verbal and quantitative scale. The other one, that, at most, 15 points on each scale could be raised through coaching.

But I mentioned in the paragraph at the bottom of page 9 that the developer of the test, C.C. Brigham, required students to initially to take the test twice. The first admission was scored and the scores were not sent anywhere except they were shared with the student. That gave the student

the chance to take the test one time, learn something about the test. The second administration was scored and the scores were sent to universities. This is a re-testing effect. The Kulik Study, that I have in the list of references, estimated re-testing effects and the estimated re-testing effects were 20-25 points on each scale, substantially larger than any coaching effects that they could find.

So then on page 10, I summarize what I've said:

1. The SAT is a good, though imperfect, predictor of applicant success at UC.
2. SAT is a reasonably strong predictor of both near-term indices of success, such as first-year GPA, as well as later-term indices, such as UC graduation rates.
3. SAT scores are not strongly related in determining eligibility for the vast majority of high school graduates who satisfy UC eligibility criteria.
4. If SAT scores were dropped as eligibility requirements and if UC were to maintain eligibility rates consistent with the Master Plan, eligibility rates for underrepresented ethnic groups would be little affected; affected almost not at all.
5. The topic of bias in SAT scores is indeed a complex issue. If one uses as an index of bias the presence of differential predictiveness of the SAT across ethnic groups, then UC data and data from other universities suggest little, if any, bias.
6. Prior validity studies by UC have shown a slight overprediction of UC GPA for certain underrepresented groups. Given this, the SAT is, in fact, something of a benefit for these groups.

7. The effects of coaching on SAT scores is not large, at least in carefully controlled studies.

The last part of this is my own concern about the kinds of criteria we use for admission and the perception of some of those criteria. I view the SAT test as under attack. That's not new. They've been under attack for quite some time. Doing something about the SAT, either dropping the SAT or switching to some other test, sounds like a simple solution, but I think the problems in front of us are far more complex.

Very quickly, I think part of the problem is money, not the test. Despite increases in state monies allocated to the K-12 system during the past several years, California still lags behind other states in per capita spending on public education. In fact, *Education Week* recently published a report entitled, "Quality Counts 1998." This report reveals California receiving an F grade for per capita school spending with a level of funding that places our state at the very bottom of the 50 states. With the diversity of students in our state -- almost surely the most diverse student body in any state in our nation -- one could easily argue that additional needed services, such as bilingual education, should lead us to be among the leading states in per capita spending on education. Instead, in 1998, we are dead last in this category. We need more money for the K-12 system.

But money isn't the only problem. Part of the problem, and therefore part of the solution, is books and other educational experiences. The Los Angeles Unified School District set aside a special $6 million fund this year dedicated to attempting to purchase books so that each child will have a book in front of him or her in each class. The superintendent acknowledged that a book in front of each child was a long-term goal and that the special

$6 million fund was probably inadequate to achieve this goal fully this year. I should note, Los Angeles Unified School District is not alone in this regard; other school districts are in similar dire straits with regard to books and other educational materials. Most would acknowledge the one key basic item of educational material is a book for each child in each class, but we are not supplying this basic need in many of our schools in our state. We need more money and more books.

But money and books are not the only problem. Part of the problem, and therefore part of the solution, is adequate facilities. The ACLU had to sue the Compton School District to supply students with working bathroom facilities, toilet paper in the stalls, classrooms with roofs that did not leak when it rained. If students attend substandard schools that have woeful facilities, that sends a message to those students they're not worthy of the time and money of the educational system. They read this message loud and clear: The educational system is not an avenue to a better life.

But money, books, and facilities are not all of the problem. Part of the problem, and part of the solution, is the need for well trained teachers who will teach to exacting standards. The most welcome reduction in class size in early grades during the last several years -- a long overdue improvement in our schools -- created a teacher vacuum, and many teachers who were not fully trained have been drawn into that vacuum. We must ensure that all teachers throughout the state are fully trained and qualified.

In addition, the state of California is presently in the process of adopting standards of performance in every major area of academic study. As these standards are put into place, we need to ensure that all teachers in the K-12 system are well trained, well informed about standards, and committed to teaching to those standards.

There are other problems we could talk about, but I'll close with an analogy. Any standardized test -- the ACT, SAT, or other tests -- are like thermometers. If you went to a doctor for a general check-up, she would put a thermometer in your mouth to measure your temperature even if you felt quite good. If the thermometer registered a temperature of 102 degrees, you could decide to investigate the disease process causing your fever or you could discard the thermometer. Dropping the SAT is like discarding the thermometer. Our academic thermometer is telling us that something is wrong. Our schools are preparing students whose achievements vary as a function of a number of dimensions, including ethnicity. We must root out the causes of the disease, improving schooling experiences for all students throughout the state of California so they have the educational experiences that will enable them to do well on standardized tests used for UC admission and in college.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you very much for your testimony, especially the last portion when you talked about the female doctor.

All right. Next please.

MR. PATRICK S. HAYASHI: Senator Hughes, it's a pleasure and an honor to be here today. My name is Pat Hayashi. I'm the Associate Vice-Chancellor for Admissions and Enrollment at UC Berkeley. I'm also something of an expert on SATs in that I took one in 1961. Mercifully, I've repressed all memories of my specific scores, but I do know that I'm a firm believer that one's fate should not be determined by one's SAT scores.

When your committee held its initial meeting in Berkeley last September, Chancellor Berdahl spoke to you about the great importance we place on the work you're doing. At Berkeley we share the same fundamental

concerns you have raised regarding access to higher education in California and we're glad that we're working together on this issue.

I've been asked to describe the role of standardized tests in the process of selecting freshman applicants for admission on a very selective campus like Berkeley. I'd like to briefly go over three areas. First, I'd like to describe how our admissions process has evolved over the past 15 years, and how we use the SAT in selecting students. Second, I'd like to describe the new admissions process we have put into place to select the freshman class that will enter in the fall of 1998 -- this coming fall. And because we are anxious to discuss our new approach with you, I brought with me several people who were essential in designing the new process. These include the Faculty Chair of our Senate Committee, Professor Jenny Franchot, our Director of Admissions, Bob Laird, and our Manager for Policy Analysis, Nina Robinson.

SENATOR HUGHES: Maybe to speed this up a little bit, because I appreciate the fact that you brought the expert witnesses from your campus who can answer these questions directly, and I'm sure they're going to have a long dissertation before they get to that to tell me why they decided to do certain things, let me ask a couple of questions because I have the last group that needs to catch airplanes. They're not from Northern California. So if I get straight to the point, then maybe I can get some specific answers.

I'm really excited about what I've read about Berkeley's new admissions policy this year and what you told me when I was on campus that you're going to be doing. I understand, and correct me if I'm wrong, that each applicant is being read in detail and measured on a more subjective basis with less emphasis on the use of indices and cutoff numbers. Is that right or is that incorrect?

MR. HAYASHI: That's exactly right. This fall we received 30,000 applications. Every single applicant will be read by two readers at least.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Does it take greater resources and expenditures to implement a plan like this?

MR. HAYASHI: Absolutely. And fortunately, Chancellor Berdahl understands the importance of giving every applicant an individualized, comprehensive assessment, so he's generously increased our budget.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. And I know that you have the highest number of applications, because everybody wants to be a UC Berkeley graduate.

MR. HAYASHI: We can't blame them.

SENATOR HUGHES: I can't either. I'm very proud to say that I have three children who are.

Would it be possible to extend this across the system? Because everybody won't be able to go to UC Berkeley. Everybody will not be able to go to UCLA. So is it possible for you to spread out this message and this practice to the other campuses? And if not, when do you think it can be?

MR. HAYASHI: I can only speak for Berkeley. I'll have to defer to my colleagues.

MS. FERRI: As I indicated to you before, the university is moving in that direction. As we revised all of our selection guidelines for the total university, following the passage of the Regents' resolution on affirmative action, this is the thrust of the university in terms of admissions. What our task force and admissions indicated very clearly is that given the magnitude of the numbers that we're dealing with and the kinds of qualifications that students bring to us, the type of talent and achievement and other experiences they bring to us, the only way that we can go about doing a fair

admissions decision process is to actually do a more comprehensive assessment of all the things that the candidate is bringing to us. So UCLA has done this for a number of years, and they are moving more and more in the direction of basically reading all the applications. Berkeley is. There are other campuses of the university, such as Irvine, that are moving in that direction. And probably Santa Barbara. So that's what is the ultimate goal of the University of California as a whole.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. So what you're telling me is that other campuses are sort of picking up different tactics in terms of the admissions process. Is it true that at the Irvine campus you have an innovative outreach program that includes a partnership with the Kaplan Test Preparation Company to provide SAT coaching at a reduced rate? Is that true, or is that just a rumor?

MS. FERRI: I don't have the exact information for you but we can provide it to you.

SENATOR HUGHES: But have you heard that too?

MS. FERRI Yes. That is correct. There are some activities that go on within the university outreach at the campus level where test preparation has been part of the outreach program. But we can provide you with some more extensive information about the whole university.

SENATOR HUGHES: I just wanted that to become a part of our record so that we can follow up on that and see what happens.

Yes.

DR. WIDAMAN: Although I've said before that it appears that coaching really does not have as strong an effect as the test coaching companies would lead you to believe, sometimes perceptions, as you know, are at least as important as fact.

SENATOR HUGHES: But it also gives a psychological security and reassurance and builds up the self-esteem of the applicant.

DR. WIDAMAN: That's what I meant by the perception.

SENATOR HUGHES: And that would also help if they were just going through the Berkeley interview process and they read all of their information as individuals, and they evaluate a longer time. In a personal interview, they'd certainly come out a lot better because they'd feel more self-assured, they have a higher self-esteem, and they make a better impression on anybody on admissions.

DR. WIDAMAN: I couldn't agree more. And what I simply wanted to do -- since I hurried through my presentation -- you'll find on one of the pages on the section on coaching that I state that although it looks -- it appears as if the best estimate of coaching is that it's a rather minor effect. But the perception that coaching might help, and having gone through coaching, could be a very valuable experience.

Our board is the Board of Admissions in Relations With Schools and we deal with outreach. There has been some discussion at BOARS -- and I'm sure there will be more in the future -- that part of our outreach efforts should be to provide coaching sessions for students throughout the state of California, make sure that some level of coaching is provided, and, I think more importantly, that students are able to take practice exams. We think that's a very important part of the university outreach, and that's something that I believe we will propose as one aspect of outreach.

I'd just like to note that it's in my report because I agree with that.

MR. HAYASHI: I supervise six outreach programs at Berkeley and every one of the programs offers SAT prep courses.

I sure would like to describe our new process. Do we have time?

SENATOR HUGHES: Don't have time.

MR. HAYASHI: Okay.

SENATOR HUGHES: I believe you.

All right. Thank you very much for being with us. Now we'd like to have the representatives from the "Independent Colleges and Universities" come up with the Cal State University system. First we'll have William Tingley, Vice President of Admissions and Financial Aid from Occidental College. And Michael Besseda, Assistant Vice President, Saint Mary's College. And next to them, from the California State University, Allison Jones, the Senior Director of Access and Retention; and Nancy Sprotte, Coordinator of Enrollment Management.

All right. Mr. Tingley.

MR. WILLIAM TINGLEY: Yes, thank you. My name is Bill Tingley and I'm Vice President and Dean of Admission at Occidental College, which, as I think you know, Madam Chair, is in Los Angeles. We're very proud of our commitment to both academic excellence and diversity. And I'm here, though, not representing Occidental's point of view on this topic, but rather because I have had extensive experience in private college admissions.

But let me mention very quickly, I'm a product of the University of California system myself, having received my degrees from UC Davis, nearby. But I have since then 30 years of experience in private college admissions; at Whitman College, a small liberal arts college in the state of Washington, 10 years at Stanford University, and most recently at Pitzer College in the Claremont colleges cluster in Southern California. In June I accepted a position at Occidental College as Dean of Admission and Financial Aid.

It's very gratifying for me to come to the microphone right after the last presentation because I think what I heard is a very good example of how we

can learn from each other. How the public sector, I think, has learned from the private college admissions sector, and in adapting its process so that it could meet the challenges that it faces. And I recall, by the way, when I was on the Stanford University admissions' staff, visits from the UCLA admissions' staff and, I think, more recently from the UC Berkeley admissions' staff, to Stanford because I believe they saw the private college selection process as an area where they could learn the techniques and the ways in which private colleges select students.

Let me say that the level of selectivity at private colleges varies a great deal from one college to the other. And with less selective colleges, the task of an admissions committee is really to evaluate how many students actually meet the criteria or meet the eligibility standards of that institution, and basically to offer admission to virtually all of those students who qualify. In the more selective, the most selective private colleges, the challenge is really quite different, and that is from among many well qualified students to identify those who have the most distinguished records, who have the strongest overall profile, who stand out, and who provide the most compelling case for admission.

But the general rule in private college admissions is that we take a very personalized approach to our selection process. We look at each individual as a whole person and we do not, at any point, reduce the student down to a mere set of statistics. So we do not have a computerized formula or an index system. In short, we do not admit by the numbers.

What I would like to say just very briefly, and then allow the other speakers to have an opportunity to speak, is that William James once said, "If you're going to give a speech, every speech should include at least one point." And what I would like to indicate today from my perspective is that when

used properly in context and together with other important factors, SATs or ACTs are a very helpful tool, albeit an imperfect tool, in assessing a student's potential for doing a certain level of work in college. And in my view, the SAT or ACT requirement should not be dropped, but rather be incorporated more effectively into a holistic assessment process. And from what I just witnessed by listening to the UC representatives, it appears to me that that is the direction that they have been taking and I applaud them for that. I think it is a wise course.

So I'm going to pause at that point because I know it's late in the afternoon and allow other speakers to have an opportunity.

Thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: How much weight does your private institution -- are you speaking for the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities or are you speaking for Occidental?

MR. TINGLEY: Well, it actually would be impossible for me to speak for all of the association because there are about 70 different private colleges. I am, however, speaking from the range of experiences that I have had and what I know about other institutions within California, private institutions. It does vary. The weight given to SAT scores in the whole holistic assessment approach does vary from college to college, depending on the degree of selectivity.

We look at many factors, and I'm guessing that these are some of the same factors that the UC Berkeley and UCLA are now looking at: the strength or rigor of the academic program, the academic performance of the student in those courses, the rank in the senior class, the strength of the letters of recommendations from teachers and counselors, the SAT, work experience, and then the self-presentation -- the essay section of the

application. In the case of many private colleges, an interview is also recommended. And then finally, assessing the potential of the student to contribute to the life of the college.

SENATOR HUGHES: Right. Because then when you interview more than an application form and you interview a real human being, it makes a tremendous difference. Unfortunately, many institutions don't have a chance to do that.

Okay, next please.

MR. MICHAEL BESSEDA: I'm Michael Besseda from Saint Mary's College and I, too, would not say that I'm speaking for all of the independent colleges. And I'll try to be brief. The gentleman I was sitting near in the back offered me something that seemed like a bribe to limit my remarks because he wants to get up next. So I'll try to be brief in response to his concerns.

It's very much the case at Saint Mary's that standardized tests are one element that we look at in making admissions decisions, and I would echo many of the sentiments that my colleague, Bill Tingley, has just voiced. But at the same time I think I might have a little bit of a more mixed set of comments about the SAT. I think Bill very well stated the case for the way in which the SAT can be positively used in the admissions process. And at Saint Mary's, as I said, it is one element that we use in looking at a very holistic evaluation.

Saint Mary's is an institution that is not highly selective. We're a selective school. We have about 3,000 applicants. We admit about 2,000 of those and we enroll about 600 freshman a year. So we're not making fine distinctions between highly qualified individuals. We're really asking the question, will this student be able to succeed at Saint Mary's College? And so one positive impact of the SAT that I don't know has been mentioned today,

except maybe obliquely, is that sometimes a strong score on the SAT can be a reason for saying, for an applicant who otherwise maybe has a mixed record, that this student possibly has the ability to be successful. And so a student at a school like Saint Mary's, that can be a critical factor in making a positive decision to admit students.

But I think it's important that in thinking about the SAT, or actually standardized tests, that we look not only at the formal ways that it's used, but sometimes the unintended consequences. And I think it's important to recognize that the standardized tests have a cultural and social value and impact that extends beyond even one campus' or one set of institution's decision making. They become measures which are used to evaluate the effectiveness of institutions. They become measures that are used to evaluate the quality of institutions. Those kinds of unintended consequences need to be thought about when we think about the SAT as well.

Thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you.

MR. ALLISON JONES: Good afternoon. I'm Allison Jones, Senior Director of Access and Retention at the California State University Office of the Chancellor. Next to me is Dr. Nancy Sprotte, who is Coordinator of Enrollment Managed Services, also of our unit in Access and Retention, having just joined us last August from San Diego State where she served for 16 years as the Director of Admission and Records, and has been in Admission and Records for about 29 years to my 28 years, so she is older than I am, and more experienced.

We share this afternoon's testimony on behalf of the California State University. What I will begin by doing is to outline the CSU systemwide policy on admission and the use of the standardized tests, and then Nancy

will discuss the actual application at the campus level at our 22 campuses so that you'll get both the systemwide as well as the campus-specific.

I wanted to begin, again just briefly for the record, to remind us that the Master Plan does in fact call for CSU to establish its admissions standards such that one-third of the graduating high school seniors are eligible to attend the CSU. And we define the upper one-third on the basis of a student being a high school graduate, the completion of a 15-unit course pattern requirement, and a B-average or qualifiable Eligibility Index. Thus, for our first-time freshman, the eligibility may be established with a specified course pattern from high school -- the 15 courses -- and a grade point average of 3.0 or better, regardless of any test score. In fact, for a student with a high school grade point average of a 3.0 or higher, a test score is not required.

Upper division transfer students -- just for clarification -- are not required to either take or submit the SAT or the ACT test scores for admission. The admission criteria at that point is dependent upon the student's completion of a general education with a C or better -- a C-average (2.0).

Of the applicants who are admitted with a grade point average above a 3.0 for fall of 1997, 73 percent of those students were admitted on the basis of their grade point average only. But of this group -- just interestingly as an aside -- 78 percent of those students submitted an SAT or an ACT, or both, even though they were not required.

Our student earlier today, Carlos Jackson, is an example. Although he took the SAT, that SAT did not factor into the admission eligibility for that student. He was admitted on the basis of his self-reported grade point average that he shared with us earlier today of a 3.2. So we have students who take the test that we don't require. But however, 27 percent of the

students who were admitted had a grade point below 3.0 and that's the case in which we use the Eligibility Index, which is a combination of the student's grade point average and the results on the SAT or the ACT test scores. So the Eligibility Index is established to help CSU determine what students actually fall into that upper one-third of the graduating high school senior class, along with the courses and so forth.

CSU does, systemwide, place a greater weight on the grade point average, however, in that Eligibility Index than we do on the performance on the test scores. And in fact, we find with our own studies for students at least applying to attending the CSU, the grade point average is twice as effective in projecting success at CSU than the SAT or the ACT. And in fact, in the Eligibility Index, we weight the grade point average significantly higher and then add it to the student's performance on the SAT. We require only the SAT I for students below a 3.0. We do not require the SAT II, or what's been known as the achievement tests.

The analysis of the correlation at CSU between the high school grade point average and success at CSU -- which we define as persistence to the second year of study -- and the analysis of the correlation between the student's test scores and success at CSU, again continue to demonstrate the high school grade point average is about twice as effective in predicting success than the grade point average. So we are different in the state of California.

The effect of using the test score for those, however, below a 3.0, in addition to helping us to define the upper one-third, it does provide students who are attending difficult programs, or students who have earned low grade point averages who would not have an opportunity to demonstrate potential for successful university study, to off-set that with some level of testing either

through the SAT or the ACT. It's what the colleague mentioned earlier. It gives that student an advantage which otherwise would not be available.

One thing I did want to acknowledge, for students within the California State University, if they do not demonstrate admissibility according to our regular admission requirement -- which again, above a 3.0 is grades only, below that is a combination of grades and scores -- campuses, as authorized in Title 5, and the state statute, allow us to admit students by exception. Special admission is available to those students. It's what we've been discussing and, Senator Hughes, you just referenced. And in those cases most of our students admitted through special admission are through our special compensatory and when we look again at the Title 5 that requires special compensatory services which are offered by EOP. That's a long-winded way of saying that the majority of these students move into our Educational Opportunity Program and as a result have ended up with personal interviews with our EOP staff, as well as recommendations from principals and counselors.

So it is that factor, that personal basis, that factors in to the admission decision for students under the special admission category. And we're authorized to admit up to 8 percent of our lower division students on the basis of special admission. So we have a caveat which provides another opportunity even if the student is unable to demonstrate eligibility otherwise.

I was planning to just say a couple of words about the Eligibility Study. And let me just again remind us, although I missed Warren Fox's presentation -- I'm sure he mentioned this this morning -- that the outcome of the 1996 CPEC Eligibility Study, particularly for the California State University, indicated that it was not the level of achievement on an SAT or an ACT, but it was actually the completion of our course pattern requirement.

More students than ever were enrolling in those courses in high school but for reasons we don't understand, and the reason why we're going to have the follow-up study, is to determine why those students did not complete the courses once they were enrolled, so that it was a matter of satisfactorily completing our 15-unit course pattern requirement in high school. And in fact, the Eligibility Study cites that as the primary cause. They indicate that only 5.2 percent of the 1996 graduating high school senior class cohort that we studied was ineligible on the basis of the Eligibility Index.

The CPEC even went so far -- which was important, I think, to indicate in the report itself, that among those graduates who had fulfilled the CSU course requirements, failure to take the required college admission exam had become an insignificant issue for CSU. So test scores are factored into our Eligibility Index, but in fact, when you look at the population and the eligibility, it is not a factor that has a significant amount of importance.

Let me now turn to Nancy, in the essence of time here, who's going to describe the use of the tests, at least at the campus level, if I may.

MS. NANCY SPROTTE: Thank you for the opportunity to be here.

When a student requests a special consideration for exception, that's when the admission officer looks more closely at the entire portfolio that the student presents and looks at test scores and grade point averages in the context of each other and other factors that may be available. It's at that point that we can use a test score where there might have been a lower grade point average either because the student was pursuing a much more rigorous curriculum, and it's an opportunity for the student to demonstrate the potential where there may have been lower grades because it was a more difficult program.

We also recognize that many of our students have outside commitments. Either they must work during high school or they choose to pursue some community activities that will be a benefit to them in the long run, and that may hinder their grade point average a little bit, where the test score may actually demonstrate the ability when the grades were a little bit lower.

If the student is seeking admission with a deficiency in one of the course areas either because there was a semester of illness or something where the student did not earn the C grade, but if that student has a high test score in a comparable area, that may be one way for the admission officer to assess the student's overall capability and general knowledge in that subject area.

SENATOR HUGHES: What percentage of students do you get that come as transfers from the community colleges? Do you have any idea?

MR. TINGLEY: Yes. Systemwide we essentially almost enroll annually two transfers to every freshman.

SENATOR HUGHES: Oh really?

MR. TINGLEY: Yes. Systemwide we maintain the Master Plan goal of 60 percent upper to 40 percent lower division by enrolling or admitting two transfers for every freshman. And in fact, systemwide our ratio of upper to lower division is closer to 70 percent to 30 percent freshman.

SENATOR HUGHES: So basically you have an older student undergraduate population.

MR. TINGLEY: Yes. The average age of our undergraduate student is around 26, as I recall.

MS. SPROTTE: And this is an area where the test score may not be as reliable. Either it's an old test score or it's a recent test score that reflects

that the student has been out of school for a while, so it would carry less weight in an admission decision in that case.

The other area where we encourage students, particularly the more advanced students, to submit the test scores is that the CSU does have the requirement for demonstrating entry-level competency in the math and English areas. And one way for the student to be exempt from the English placement test would be to score high enough on either the ACT or SAT to be exempt. The SAT I with a score of 550 or an ACT English score of 25 would exempt the student from the EPT. Similarly, the entry-level math test with a minimum SAT I score in the math area of 560, or an ACT math score of 25, that student would be exempt. So that student then could be placed without further testing, which is certainly in the student's interest and ours also.

So there are a number of benefits to having the score available, even though for many of our students it was not required as a basis for admission because so many of them do qualify on the basis of the 3.0 grade point average.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Thank you very much. The last group -- how are high schools preparing students to take the exam. Now let's hear from some high school folks, who I understand have to catch a plane.

Jeffrey Davis, Principal of Coronado High School; Thomas Brock, Principal of Gretchen Whitney High School; Diane Duncan, counselor at Woodland High; and Robert Collins, Director of Instruction at LA Unified School District.

We save the best for last. Now you're going to give us the real information about how our schools are preparing our students to take the exam.

Okay, who wants to be first? Jeffrey?

MR. JEFFREY DAVIS: I'd be happy to. Thank you very much for inviting me here today.

SAT preparation -- well, the preparation starts with a strong K-12 program. That's where it's really at. We do additional things when we get the students at the high school, so I'll spend a few moments to share that with you.

Quite simply, you start with a well defined vision for your school and a lot of collaboration among your staff, and your parents, and your students, and your community. You have to have a philosophy that the SAT preparation is important, or that idea. And most importantly, you have to have a dedicated staff that's capable of training the students and preparing them to take the exam.

Specifically with regards to what we do at Coronado High School, we started doing things a little bit differently about four years ago as part of our restructuring program. Restructuring for us means whatever it takes to improve student performance.

We started by integrating into all of our math and English classes materials that would help prepare students to take the SAT, to help them with their math and their verbal aspects of that examination.

SENATOR HUGHES: What percentage of your students do in fact take the SATs?

MR. DAVIS: Approximately 60 to 70 percent of our graduating class.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. So you're higher than the statewide average.

MR. DAVIS: Yes.

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay.

MR. DAVIS: In addition to the integration, something that we began a few years ago also, was the PSAT. It's always been an option for students to take on the weekend for our juniors, but we now require it for all freshmen, sophomores and juniors. So they do that for all three years.

There is a fee with that. It's $10. We're a public school. We ask that the students and their parents, if they can afford to do that, to please pay the fee. If they can't, we pay that for them.

Quite an extensive amount of work goes as follow-up to the PSAT exam. We have parent evenings when the results come in where all the counselors for one evening, all the ninth grade parents we invite back to school, and the counselors during that evening will interpret and explain the results, and they are individualized for the students. So we share that information with the parents and we talk about what they can do to help their students and to remediate them and where extra work is necessary. The counselors also visit all of the classes at the high school and speak to the students in small groups of 25 to 30 students and do the same thing as they did for the parents in the evening meetings.

We also use the PSAT as a planning tool because it provides personal scores and itemized analysis for the students and also some guidance information for those students. We also realize that the more times that a student takes the PSAT,- the more times they practice for the SAT exam, the better they'll do when they take their SAT exam. We believe it's important for us to do everything that's possible to help that student score as high as they can on the SAT because we know what an important factor that is in terms of the criteria for selection in terms of what university that they choose to go to.

SENATOR HUGHES: I imagine you don't have much of a problem convincing students that it's important for them to take the exam. They just accept it as part of going through your high school, right?

MR. DAVIS: Yes. That's correct. We have established a culture, an atmosphere on the campus where PSAT exams are coming. It's not like, "Oh, we have to take the exam." It's "PSAT exams are coming, this is important, this is preparation for us." And we reinforce that each year with those meetings with the parents and with the students individually.

It also helps for students that don't do well. It helps them to establish some relevancy like, "I need to work harder," "I need to work on these skills." And sometimes a student that wasn't planning on attending a four-year university says, "Ah, I probably don't have the skills to do it," and does better than they think, all of a sudden realizes, "You know what, maybe I can do it." And that provides some relevancy and some encouragement for that individual. We want to increase the number of national merit scholars that we have and that is a result of their PSAT their junior year. So by taking the PSAT those additional two years, we do that and the students can follow their scores for the three years.

Additionally, we too offer SAT review courses. The SAT review course, we offer two sets. One, of course, you can take The Princeton Review. It is popular in the San Diego County area. But we have very few students actually take that. The review that we offer through the school, through our adult education, meets for approximately six weeks and it's a $10 fee for our students. And also, of course, if they don't have the $10, we waive that fee or we have a fund that can pay that for the student. So students are coming back in the evening taking their review. And we do that in conjunction with the San Diego Department of Education. They have an SAT assistance

program where the students can take the SAT exam and then it's graded in a very -- or practice exam. It's graded in a very short period of time, comes back with an itemized analysis for that student in what areas they need to remediate and work on, and we incorporate that into the SAT review course that we offer in the evening.

So that's a summary very quickly.

SENATOR HUGHES: That's wonderful. And I regret that Senator Alpert is probably busy taking care of something else, but I'm going to tell her how impressed I am by her high school.

MR. DAVIS: Well, thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Thomas Brock, Principal of the Gretchen Whitney High School.

MR. THOMAS BROCK: Yes. Thank you, Senator Hughes, for this chance to be here. Let me just say a couple of things very briefly about Whitney, and then put Whitney in context with--

SENATOR HUGHES: Where is Whitney?

MR. BROCK: Whitney is in the city of Cerritos. It's one of five public high schools in the ABC Unified School District. And the ABC is very proud to be one of the top 10 performing districts in the state.

SENATOR HUGHES: Is that where the young lady was from?

MR. BROCK: That's where Karen Gau is from. My partner on the airplane.

Whitney has the distinction of raising our SAT scores every year for the past several years, and I'm told that we are the highest SAT scorers in the state. Last year the main SAT score from Whitney was 1326. One hundred percent of our students go to the university or to a four-year college. One

hundred percent graduate, one hundred percent go to college, and we're very pleased with that.

Whitney is different in three ways from the other public schools in our district. One, because it is the district Magnet school for academically proficient kids with a very single purpose--

SENATOR HUGHES: So you have the cream to begin with. No. Isn't that true? You're the Magnet school?

MR. BROCK: The answer is both yes and no because we do not necessarily have the highest scoring or the smartest kids. Many kids who score higher than our students just choose not to come to Whitney and will stay in one of the good university prep programs at the other schools.

What we can honestly say is that our students have demonstrated academic proficiency by scoring in the top quartile of the district placement test. So I feel confident in saying that every one of our students is some place in the top 25 percent of that particular placement test which includes an essay and some objective tests.

What really distinguishes our students, I believe, is that they are focused on going to the university. So that's one distinction, we are a single purpose school preparing students for the university.

Another distinction is that we are a seventh through twelfth grade high school. Our seventh graders are part of the six-year high school. They're not in a middle school on our campus. The only exception to that is they participate in middle school interscholastics rather than CIF. But in every other way they are one year of a six-year high school.

A third distinguishing characteristic of our school is that we are a districtwide Magnet school. We attract students from every end of ABC, and the *LA Times* has characterized our community as being the most ethnically

diverse community in America. And certainly, Whitney reflects that diversity that we have in our community. We have kids from both socioeconomic extremes and we are all colors of the rainbow. What we have in common is every student and every parent and every teacher knows our mission is to send kids to the university.

When I ask teachers, "What do you do? What does the school do to prepare our students for the SAT?" the answer I get is, "Nothing. We don't do anything to prepare them for the SAT." The other truth is everything we do at our school prepares students for the SAT test. Because we are preparing them for success at the university, everything we do in our classes all day, every day, also is preparing them for the SAT.

Our teachers and our students will tell you there are three things that contribute to their high scores. One of them is, as Jeff pointed out at his school, our school's culture. The peer culture is one of academic striving and academic excellence. It's not uncool to do homework. You can come at 6:30 in the morning. In fact, we've had to add extra staff so we are staffed in the hallways from 6:30 in the morning until 6:00 at night. You can come and see groups of kids sitting in the hallway, helping each other with their lessons, helping prepare for class. It is a culture of success, and the uncool thing would be to put off doing your homework until a few minutes before class.

The second thing I believe that helps prepare students for the university is the fact that our teachers and our students have a social relationship. And I don't mean they treat each other as peers. There's respect for the teachers as well as respect for the students, but there's a definite feeling that they are on the same team and they are working together for a common goal.

There is some socializing. I heard the other day some students talking with a psych teacher. There's a new Robin Williams film that has something to do with psychology and the kids were saying, "Boy, we sure would like it if you would come see that movie with us and help us analyze it." And I can't tell you for sure, but I bet the teacher went. And Karen wasn't giving you an exception when she talked about Mr. Robbi will have coffee at Starbuck's to talk about poetry.

There is a definite feeling that the teachers and the students are on the same team working together, so they have that kind of social relationship. It also gives students the opportunity to get some advice from their teachers. I know that a student had a conversation the other day with a teacher about, "What college should I go to? It's either U-Penn or USC. Help me make a decision." It's not just the counselors that help them with university admissions. And they also get help with important issues like, "Where should I take my date for the prom before we go to the dance?"

The third thing that I think distinguishes our school in a way that contributes to the high SAT scores is because parents want their kids to go to that school. We have great support from the parents and the community. We have it as our goal that every student in every class will have a textbook. And especially as we add new classes, new AP classes, that becomes very taxing on the general fund, on the textbook fund, and our parents and students will together go out and raise money to buy books so that every student has a textbook.

SENATOR HUGHES: How old is your school building?

MR. BROCK: Our school building is 24 years old and the school itself is 22 years old. And our school building is miserable.

SENATOR HUGHES: So that's a brand new school in my community.

MR. BROCK: It's a brand new school in your community; however, I bet you wouldn't trade with us. Our school was built as a community center 25 years ago. It was not built as a high school. We laugh about our cardboard walls. If you think there's going to be an earthquake, quick, run inside the building because if the walls collapse on you, you won't be hurt.

Our intercom system means you raise your voice and say, "Mrs. so-and-so." You can stick your finger through the walls in many places. We're very proud of a new gymnasium that was dedicated this year. But, except for the new gym, all of our facilities, I believe you would say, Senator, are below par. Our biggest classroom is below, according to our chief financial officer, the average size of the classrooms in the state, and our award winning band practices and performs in an abandoned restaurant on campus. So our facilities, while they may be only 25 years old, are themselves very inadequate, but our teaching staff, our parents, and our kids are all there for the very same reason and so the inadequacy of the facilities does not get in our way.

We do have the support of the community and we do have the social relationship with the teachers, and we do have the school culture. We are all there for the same purpose, and I believe that's what results in high SAT scores, but that is very clearly what results in our high admissions rate.

Almost 70 percent of our kids go to the University of California, and I was very pleased to hear the gentleman from UC Berkeley. Last year we sent 45 students to Berkeley. This year about 63, which is more than a third of our graduating class, and so we may be known as Berkeley South; or if the trend continues, maybe they'll be Whitney North. But our kids are very, very proud of their high acceptance rate at the UCs and the private schools.

SENATOR HUGHES: That's great. Congratulations to you.

Our next witness is Diane Duncan, counselor at Woodland High School.

MS. DIANE DUNCAN: Yes. Woodland High is a high school that comprises tenth through twelfth grade. The ninth grade is currently held at the junior high schools. One of our efforts has been to try and make the ninth grade feel more part of the high school since a lot of those students view the ninth grade as an extension of the junior high. And so that's been kind of a difficult thing.

One of the things we've done over the last couple of years is done a "How to Get Your Student Into College Night" for students, seventh through twelfth grade. We've gotten the junior high counselors and the high school counselors together to put on a program in both English and Spanish where we talk about the UC/CSU admission requirements. We talk about the testing requirements. We talk about financial aid. We have representatives from the community college, CSU and UC also out and talk with the parents. And this is the second year we've had that program and we've had a pretty good response, though we still need to work on getting the junior high's part of thinking about college.

I think Woodland is pretty typical. We offer the plan test to the sophomores. I struggle with getting students to take the test. We offer fee waivers. We've dropped from 50 kids taking to the plan, to one time 14 kids taking it, back up to 30, and we're really struggling trying to get our sophomores thinking about being seniors and thinking about testing. I think they pay more attention when their juniors. We advertise the PSAT and we get our numbers up to about 175 students taking the PSAT test. We have a class of 500, so we need to make some progress on getting students wanting to take the plan and the PSAT test.

We've put together basic information sheets on testing, telling students about the basic plan PSAT. We hand those out to parents. We hand them out to junior high schools. We publish the information in our course catalog. We put it out in our monthly newsletter in both English and Spanish, trying to get students involved. We have different groups on campus: our AVID program, EOP program, MESA program, Academic Talent Search that come and work with students. And I know that coming up shortly, EOP and Kaplan are doing a pre-SAT exam in February -- I'm not sure of the exact date -- and I know Academic Talent Search provides tutoring. MESA provides some SAT prep work with students as well.

We recommend students take it at the end of their junior year, again in their senior year, both the ACT and SAT, because some students feel better on one test versus the other. We have our bulletin board in the hallway. We announce all the deadlines. Definitely talk about the fee waiver program with SAT able to take four tests and ACT one test, and try to get as many students as possible to take the test using the fee waivers.

So I think that's pretty much the kinds of things that we do. I know with some of the technology grants, the counseling program is going to have a couple of computers set up with Internet access for students to use to do various college searches. And I know that the College Board has some online services. So we're trying to provide more access of information to students to encourage them to take the SAT or the ACT. We have all the materials, the "Preparing the SAT I and II," and "Preparing to take the ACT." We talk about materials available in the public library or at bookstores that students can buy. Kaplan has done some drawings at our "College Nights," giving information away to parents, trying to encourage students to take their program, or showing them the different materials that are available for

students to prepare for the SAT. UC Davis offers different programs. I know that I get flyers regularly on "Taming the SAT," and I believe the costs are about $125.

SENATOR HUGHES: What campuses do most of your students apply to?

MS. DUNCAN: Sac State or UC Davis.

SENATOR HUGHES: UC Davis or Sac State, because they're close. They are in proximity.

MS. DUNCAN: Right. We have a lot of students at Sac State who enroll in special admissions through EOP or CAMP program. We have some students who do get in special admissions on athletics. But a lot of our Latino students get into Sac State through the EOP program.

SENATOR HUGHES: Okay. All right. The best for last. Mr. Collins.

MR. ROBERT COLLINS: I'll give you the contrast to a certain extent, a picture of the Los Angeles Unified School District and where we are at in terms of this topic.

I spent 11 years as a teacher at Locke High School and four years as the assistant principal at Fremont in South Central Los Angeles. The rest of my years throughout the district in senior high schools, and my responsibility now is senior high school instruction in Los Angeles. It's a very large district, I don't have to tell anyone here. We're talking about 53 comprehensive high schools, 43 continuation schools, 6 option schools, and an independent study program that has 5,000 students enrolled in it.

Sixty-five percent of the students who took the SAT in Los Angeles Unified School District last year spoke a language other than English as their primary language. My concern -- and then I'll give you a picture of some recommendations I have and what our district does -- is that students like

Carlos Jackson's applications sitting in the college admissions offices now all have 3.5's, 3.6's, 4.25's, all those wonderful GPAs.

Strong, rigorous curriculum. As the Director of Admissions at UC Berkeley said, 95 percent of the students are eligible based on everything. What we don't talk about -- who is competitive and who will be admitted. The SAT is going to become, for those students, a critical issue.

My concern is that I have a lot of Carlos Jacksons; students who have been speaking English for less than four years taking a standardized test, and that's going to become the judge of their character, their maturity, their persistence and what they are able to accomplish and contribute to a college. I have other students who are too poor to take academic preparation classes, $600 and $700 or more. I guess that was an expensive one that I heard about.

I've heard mixed and conflicting things that coaching doesn't help. Well, I would submit that these companies are not in the business if coaching didn't help. And I think we have statistics that show, and I have evidence, and I have students who will show, 50, 60, 100 point gains because they were able to access SAT. That, I think, is a major access and equity question for this state. It certainly is for my district, and I am concerned. I have students, particularly underrepresented minority students, who may not have the opportunity to attend the University of California mainly because of the circumstances of their household, because of the language that they were born with. Knowing that, I know the SAT, and my district and my teachers know the SAT is important, so we have to play in that arena.

While counseling has been raised as an issue and a concern, and it certainly is, our counseling loads are 400, 500, 600. At the same time our district provides to each school in the district a college counselor whose

responsibilities are to provide financial aid guidance, college counseling guidance and guidance for the scholastic aptitude and the ACT tests. We run, or have run in the past -- we're looking for funding now -- an SAT preparation course for 3,800 students in the district. It runs four Saturdays and the teachers are trained by UCLA. I have no illusions that it's the quality of what Kaplan offers or Princeton Review offers over a period of six weeks. But it is an effort to provide students with some strategies in order to be successful in that arena.

We are working with Kaplan Learning Services now. We have trained cadres of English teachers in all of our high schools on how to teach test taking strategies in SAT.

SENATOR HUGHES: Now, what incentive do the teachers have to take those courses?

MR. COLLINS: What we did first, Senator, was to bring those teachers -- actually, the department chairs and another individual from each of the high schools, both middle and senior high schools, into an all-day meeting to go through what these strategies were, how they worked. The pedagogy. The incentive that came back from it was it is not financial, the incentive that came back from it was that they felt that it was the most worthwhile workshop they have been in in 20 to 25 years. That they learned more in two hours than many times we learn in a lot of the theoretical professional development programs we go through all the time, because it did teach the critical reading skills that we skip and miss all too often.

The trick now, and what we're doing now, is we are training English departments and math departments in schools throughout our school district. Now, please remember, we have 56 high schools -- 53 high schools to get to, and that's where our mission is right now. We're going to be working

tomorrow with Princeton Review to discuss how they can provide a similar service within our school district for teachers as well. It's critical that our teaching staffs -- and in many cases, as you're well aware, they are young teaching staffs and, in some cases, inexperienced -- that they have these materials and these strategies in order to work with kids, not just in a test preparation basis, because as the gentleman from Coronado said, it has to be part of the curriculum. It has to be aligned and part of systemically what we do within the school district itself.

In that context, my concern though, goes beyond the ... (tape turned) ... with Princeton Review or with test taking strategies or the SAT.

The issue for this state and the issue for our school district, I sincerely believe, is one of the quality of the curriculum that our youngsters are going to be required to take and pass in order to get a high school diploma. My reticence, and anger in some cases, about standardized tests is their history in this country. At the turn of the century, those tests, those intelligence tests, those aptitude tests, were used to divide, segregate, and track youngsters into academic and into vocational tracks. Even when I hear for a minute in this room, "Well, the SAT is for the kids who are going to college," in this state, every kid has to go to college now. We can't afford to have the bluebirds and the redbirds. And if we're going to continue that through standardized testing and make it an entry point, I think we'll make a very, very serious mistake for youngsters.

But let me go back to the curriculum issue. Senator Alpert, last session, introduced legislation -- I understand it's been re-introduced in a different form -- but unless we demand and expect that every youngster in our school district and in this state takes the same curriculum as the students in suburban areas, in Magnet school programs, then we will get

what we sow both in terms of standardized tests and in terms of where youngsters are going. Every youngster in my school district can pass algebra and geometry, and Algebra IIA and chemistry and biology. And unfortunately, in some cases, that belief is not widely held throughout the state.

Do you want to change -- and I think that begins with the ACT and the SAT, their own statistics and studies will show you, the higher level of math you take, the higher your score is going to be on those exams. We have an obligation to our youngsters to provide that curriculum to them and I will add, with that, expand the advanced placement programs in each and every one of our campuses.

SENATOR HUGHES: Now, doesn't the LA Unified School District have a problem with the qualified teachers with the credentials to teach the subject area that you say is so critical to their students' success? Let's face the reality. You have more substitute teachers perhaps than any other school district. You're just groping for warm bodies. But what kinds of incentives does LA Unified School District provide for teachers to upgrade themselves in certain academic skills? Do you have salary differentials? Do you have anything else that motivates the teachers to go back and take these courses?

MR. COLLINS: The College Board -- and it's probably one of the critical areas for us or for any school district -- provides an extensive program of training to teachers in advanced placement. Through the funds that we have -- and they are limited -- we send teachers to these workshops, we encourage them to go to the workshops, we pay for the workshops. But I will tell you, when we're talking about having an advanced placement right now in our school district, 23,000 students in AP classes, and looking at expanding

and developing it, there is a real significant need to find money, to find funds to support that type of professional development.

I will add another issue that I think that we're looking at, the University of California has looked at, and some other educational programs -- Redondo Beach, in particular have looked at -- is the whole issue of distance learning, the whole issue of virtual learning. We're expecting in our school district at the senior high school level an extraordinary amount of growth that will tax, to the limit, the facilities that we currently have and actually exceed what we have now, and I think that's going to happen throughout the state. The University of California, through the Internet, is now delivering, I believe, 20 courses. And in fact, if you've seen some of the pedagogy and some of the curriculum, while it will never replace a teacher, a good qualified teacher, it will certainly provide some supplemental areas in which we can go, and we're exploring that area in particular right now.

SENATOR HUGHES: Good. Well, thank you. Is there anything else the people here at the table have to say?

MR. TINGLEY: I might add that I think strong leadership in individual districts, that leadership to allow schools in local communities to develop their philosophy and their vision, a lot could be done with that shared decision-making and people working together in their community.

SENATOR HUGHES: Absolutely. Thank you so much for being here with us.

All right. Our last panel, "Research on Standardized Tests." I hope these people are still with us.

Robert Schaeffer, Educational Director of FAIRTEST; David Leonard, Professor of Political Science at UC Berkeley; Michael Hout, Professor of

Sociology, UC Berkeley; and speaking about the largest societal and community ramifications, Joe Jaramillo, staff attorney for MALDEF.

Okay, Mr. Schaeffer.

MR. ROBERT SCHAEFFER: Good afternoon, Senator. I am Bob Schaeffer, the Public Education Director of FAIRTEST, which is the national center for fair and open testing. We are based in Cambridge, Massachusetts. And I want to thank you for inviting us and for your tremendous staff work in putting together this hearing and the briefing materials.

Our organization was founded in 1985 by leaders of the nation's major civil rights' student education reform and feminist organizations in response to the unregulated explosion of standardized testing across the nation. Our mission statement notes that standardized testing creates and reinforces racial, class, gender and cultural barriers to equal opportunity and damages the quality of education.

From the beginning, our concerns rested on two pillars: equity and excellence, simultaneously. That is why we've worked for 13 years now to end the abuses, misuses and flaws of standardized tests, and to replace them with better forms of assessment based on genuine performance.

The issues confronting California's system of higher education are quite similar to those now facing universities across the nation; with your situation, of course, intensified by the passage of the Regents' resolution and Prop. 209.

As you may know, FAIRTEST -- and I think the reason we were probably invited here today -- is the nation's leading advocate of admission systems in which standardized test scores are de-emphasized, of Test Score Optional policies, and systems where test scores play only a minimal role.

We've been involved in this issue almost from the beginning of our organization because we began looking at the experience of a handful of

colleges like Bates and Boden, which are prominent ad-exempt, score-optional systems.

In our 1987 report, *Beyond Standardized Tests: Admissions Alternatives At Work,* that your staff does have, both publicize and catalyze the early stages of this movement. At that stage, and today, we have found that every school that has dropped or de-emphasized admissions testing requirements uniformly reports that their new system produced entering classes which were both more diverse in a variety of ways -- race, gender, class, geography and intellectual style -- and at least as academically able as their predecessors. And we're in the process of updating and expanding that report.

The Test Score Optional movement gained tremendous momentum the very next year when the University of Chicago Press published this book, *The Case Against the SAT*, done by independent researchers who looked at a vast body of governmental data. And what they concluded, based on a close look at that -- Professors James Crouse and Dale Trusheim -- is they concluded, based on the statistics, that the SAT neither helps colleges and universities improve their admissions decisions, nor does it help applicants choose schools where they will be successful. In fact, they conclude that the only impact of SATs -- and that's the only test they looked at -- is to reduce the number of African Americans and low-income students who are admitted. At that time they did not look at the comparable impacts for Latinos or for women, but we know from test score data that the impacts are likely to be similarly negative.

Despite protestations from those who profit from the testing industry, the mounting evidence has accelerated Test Score Optional policies around the nation. Each year more schools, big and small, have either dropped their SAT and ACT requirements, de-emphasized them, or admitted what was true

all along: They really didn't use test scores to make decisions about applicants, they just required them so that they could look prestigious in college guide books.

The reasons for the continuing growth of the Test Score Optional movement are as varied as the institutions. They conclude concerns about test biases -- and I think we'll hear some about gender bias from Professor Leonard from Berkeley who did a very fine study -- its consistent, legally proven, underprediction of women, which is the legal definition of bias; the negative impact from using cutoff scores on otherwise academically qualified African Americans, Latinos, and new Asian immigrants; and the testmakers own research on the unique problems faced by those whose first language is not English when they take the test.

The second concern that's motivated Test Score Optional is concern about the test's imprecision. On the SAT, for example, the testmakers admit that two students' SAT scores must differ by more than 120 points combined before an admission's officer can be sure it is a true difference in whatever the score actually measures. So when a system uses 10 point differences, the difference between getting an item right and getting that same item wrong to make decisions, they're violating the scientific role of the test because it's nowhere near that precise.

And a third concern is coachability. There is a wide body of independent research, contrary to what was stated at this table, or earlier, that shows that a good test preparation course raises scores on the average by about 100 points. We've summarized that research in a report called, *The SAT Coaching Coverup,* which I will leave with you. But as you've noted, that because such courses now cost $700 to $800 typically, where private tutors who do that type of work cost $1,500 to $2,500, that is not available uniformly

in a state like California. And thus, a young, say, Latino daughter of farm workers is triply disadvantaged on the SAT or the ACT by her ethnicity and her language and her gender, and added to those disadvantages is the fact that her parents cannot pay for coaching courses.

On this issue, of course, from our perspective, the test manufacturers speak out of both sides of their mouths. They imply coaching doesn't work and they sell coaching products.

All these pressures in concerns came to a head in the last two years. First, in Texas with the *Hopwood* court decision, which is about a year ahead of you in the process of seeing that work its way through the admissions system and in terms of a legislative response, the Texas experience is worth looking at in about a minute's worth of detail. The first thing that happened in Texas is the state had the Higher Education Coordinating Board look at the impact of the SAT in their admissions system, and they reached a series of conclusions that were quite strong for people within the system. For example, "The committee concludes that the use of standardized tests unduly limits admissions. It has a chilling effect on the motivations and aspirations of underserved populations. Except at the extremes, SAT and ACT scores do not adequately predict grades in core freshmen courses or the probability of college graduation. Eve . the testing services emphasize that scores should only be used as part of any process."

So to make a long legislative story short -- and as someone who has worked in the Legislature, and I'm sure you know these things are always much more complicated than they seem on the surface -- a group of legislators proposed, based on the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Report, and worked their way through the legislature, and ultimately, Governor George Bush signed a proposal which is now law for the class being admitted

to the University of Texas system for this coming fall that provides that any student who graduated in the top 10 percent of his or her high school class is automatically admitted to any University of Texas college anywhere. And for everyone else, test scores are no more than one part in 12 of the factors that will be considered for admissions in that system.

I've been on panels in a couple of conferences with folks from the Texas system, and though they note it's been very difficult to shift quite rapidly, it was signed earlier this year and it's in effect right now -- it was signed late last year -- that they are very hopeful that it will meet the goal of maintaining and enhancing diversity, and still keeping a very high quality class.

I want to use my final minute to talk about language, which seems appropriate on an academic panel. There's a number of -- I would call them false metaphors that have been used repeatedly here today in the literature that I have read that help frame the way that we see it. The first is the metaphor of the common yardstick which we see quite frequently in the College Board's publications: The notion that the SAT, and less so the ACT, is a common measure that we can apply to students of all backgrounds and get something meaningful. Well, we've long dismissed that metaphor as being a little odd since, as the testmakers tell us, the yardstick is imprecise by about 120 points or so before you can tell that it's actually measuring the same thing. So if it is a common yardstick, it's made of something like Silly Putty.

But you need not take FAIRTEST's word for it because we have the word of the College Board's partner in manufacturing the SAT, ETS, who, in a series of ads, including one in the *New York Times* -- Nancy Cole, who is a psychometrician, a measurement expert, who is president of ETS -- wrote, "It

is a myth that a test will provide a unitary, unequivocal yardstick for ranking of merit. In fact, test data show clearly there are many possible rank orderings." And she goes on to demolish the notion of the common yardstick that the other partner in the team, the SAT team, is making.

The second metaphor that we heard here today, and we see also in the writings of College Board President Donald Stewart in your press packet, is the notion that we shouldn't throw out the thermometer just because we don't like the results. Well, that's common sense. But what happens if the thermometer is defective? If it consistently gives wrong readings and leads to treatments that don't help people and actually harm them, then the common sense thing to do is replace the thermometer or fix it.

For example, when my son -- who, by the way, went through the college admissions process; he's here, he's a senior in high school -- when he was young and he seemed to have a fever and was feeling ill and our fancy newfangled electronic thermometer kept saying that his temperature was below normal, we knew there was something wrong with the thermometer and we replaced the battery in it, and when it still didn't work we sent it back and had it replaced because the thermometer was broken. So claiming that it's somehow a magic thermometer that is correct is a major piece of falsehood.

And finally, there is the myth that test scores accurately measure merit. I know Professor Hout will direct some comments to that even more. But that is the most bogus notion of all. Test scores measure something. They certainly measure your ability to take standardized tests. They measure something that relates very marginally to real academic performance. But the notion that people can be rank-ordered based on their test scores, as some of the UC system does in default, and then selection

decisions be made on test scores using cutoff scores and using top-to-bottom rankings is an extreme misuse of the test and a misunderstanding of what it can do.

So what should California do? I sat through the entire hearing today and listened to a number of very bright and very balanced presentations. I thought that Professor Garcia's comments for the Latino Eligibility Task Force were in the right direction: Build yourself a new system that reflects California's unique needs in population. Take the best of what Texas has done and admit a slice of those who have performed the best in their high schools, wherever they happen to be born, wherever their parents have to live. Take four or five percent and say, "You've done the best where you are. You get a shot at the next level." And then use a system -- perhaps again like Texas -- in which test scores play a minimal or no role, to look at genuine academic performance and build a system. That's the way that California can continue its mission for higher education -- building on the twin pillars of equity and excellence -- and if that remains your mission, FAIRTEST is pleased to help you in any way possible.

Thank you.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you, Mr. Schaeffer.

All right. David Leonard, Professor of Poli-Sci, UC Berkeley.

PROFESSOR DAVID LEONARD: Thank you. The reason for my presence here before you today is that I'm the former chair of the Academic Senate Committee of the Berkeley faculty who oversees admissions and admissions policy for undergraduates at Berkeley. And in that capacity when I was chair, I undertook a major study, which is going to be published shortly, of the performance over the six years that students are typically at Berkeley,

of undergraduates who had been admitted to Berkeley between 1986 and 1988. That's about 10,000 people.

I do want to make clear though, before I start to get into this, that despite the fact that I originated this research in a quasi-official capacity, I am here speaking to you today in my purely personal capacity. As a professor I don't represent the Academic Senate of Berkeley, nor do I represent--

SENATOR HUGHES: But you're speaking as an academician.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: I am speaking as a professor.

SENATOR HUGHES: And a researcher.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: But I want to make sure you understand I don't represent Berkeley in doing so.

SENATOR HUGHES: But you do represent your profession and your point of view.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: That's right.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: The historical and advertised purposes of the SATs is to assist in predicting college grades of applicants, and is the reason that university admissions officers use them.

In my testimony to you today, I'm going to evaluate the fairness of the tests exclusively in terms of their ability to perform this task of prediction in a way that does not lead to overestimating or underestimating the grades of any group of potential college students. For example, if the math scores of women were lower than those of men -- now, the math SAT scores of women were lower than those of men, as they generally are -- that would not be an automatic sign of bias in the way in which I'm looking at it. I would consider the math SATs biased only if women did a better job in college math courses

than the SAT would lead us to predict. And that turns out to be precisely the case.

The SATs make a small but significant underprediction of women's grades. This problem persists when high school grades are used as well in making the prediction. Since high school grades neither over- nor underestimate what women's grades in college are going to be, using them can only mitigate but not correct the effects of the SATs themselves. The problem of underprediction of women's grades applies not only to the aptitude tests, what we now call the SAT I and used to be called simply the SATs, but also applies to almost all of the achievement tests, what are now known as the SAT II. The one exception in the bevy of College Board tests is the English Achievement test which requires the students to write an essay in addition to doing the usual multiple choice questions.

Now, the problem that we have here with these predictions simply is illustrated by the accompanying figure, which is at the back of what I gave you, which shows that quite consistently, no matter what the level of performance that a student has on the tests and that leads us to think that women are going to do, that women in fact do better than what the tests lead us to predict. Now, that particular graph is based on the use of an equal weighting between students' high school grades and their performance on five College Board tests: the SAT Math and English, and the English Achievement Test, the Math Achievement Test, and then one other achievement test of the student's choice. We see a consistent gap between male and female performance.

This problem of underprediction of female performance persists even when we make allowances for differences in the types of courses that men and women take; for example, by looking at their performance by major. This

pattern is extremely well established in the educational testing literature and itself is no longer contested. I could point to numerous Educational Testing Service studies which show precisely what it is that I've just described to you.

What is under dispute is where the problem comes from. In other words, why women do better than the test scores say they're going to and whether the problem is large enough to have any meaningful impact on admissions.

Now, those who defend the test say that the problem comes from the fact that young women generally have better study habits than men do. And as a result, on average they do better than men with the same "mental aptitude." There is evidence that this is true on average. Those who criticize the test points to several features of the test that are known to give men an advantage, on average, over women and which do not accurately reflect the real occupational or academic world. These features are, first of all, the fact that the tests test by multiple choice, which encourages guessing. Secondly, the absence for the SAT I of any essay writing. And third, the speediness -- what's called in the technical literature, the speediness of the test -- the fact that they create a setting in which there is high pressure to make very quick decisions, and where one is evaluated not only on the correctness of the decisions you've made, not only on the correctness of the answers you've given, but on how many questions you answered.

Now, I personally believe that both sides of this controversy are correct. I think that the tests both leave out a measure of work habits and that there are limitations in the test themselves. But as an academic, I want to concede to you that the literature still has not given us a definitive answer as to where the problem comes from. What is clear, however, in this controversy is

that one cannot make fully accurate use of the test without an awareness of the underprediction problem, wherever it happens to come from.

The second issue concerns the consequences of the acknowledged underprediction of women's grades. On first look it would appear that the underprediction is very small. On average, probably a gap of .06 grade points on a scale of 4. Or, if you want to put that into a SAT test, probably a gap of about 35 points on every SAT test. But it turns out that, at large, highly competitive public universities such as Berkeley, when you do admissions objectively by the numbers and base your decisions on high school grades and SATs alone, you will in fact, as we did in fact at Berkeley do, reduce the number of women in the freshmen class from about 52 percent, which is about where you would predict it would be on the basis of the eligibility studies that we've done, to about 47 percent. In other words, you shift the gender of 5 percent of the freshmen class. At Berkeley that means that about 200 to 300 women a year were denied admission and replaced by men who would perform less well than the women would have in the same Berkeley classes.

Comparable effects are evident at other large, highly competitive state universities; places where the large volume of numbers makes by-the-numbers decisions likely and where the stiff competition makes small differences in qualifications highly consequential. The literature suggests that similar problems apply to the SAT -- I'm sorry, apply to the ACT -- but that is not as well studied as what we have on the SATs.

Now, I do want to say that thanks to the research that I did, and to the efforts of the administration, the problem has largely been fixed now on the Berkeley campus so that what I've described to you is a historical rather than a contemporary problem.

SENATOR HUGHES: Because of their new admissions procedure?

PROFESSOR LEONARD: They've created a whole new set of admissions procedures in order to deal with precisely this problem, and I think Dr. Hayashi testified to you earlier today about this. But the fix that they made is an awkward and extremely expensive fix. The awkwardness arises from the legal and political challenges that would occur in response to making any adjustments in presumptively objective and unbiased test scores -- let's put all of that in quotation marks -- "presumptively objective and unbiased test scores," as long as the Educational Testing Service refuses to publicly acknowledge the problems that we've documented here. And indeed, consistently and publicly, the Educational Testing Service denies the magnitude, the importance of these problems, and attacks the legitimacy of anyone who points them out.

I believe that the ETS has not been responsible in dealing with this problem. It needs to either fix the test or give a clear, legally usable warning to all users of the existence of the prediction problems that are associated with them.

Now, to move now to something that is not a part of my own research, the background statement on this committee's hearing suggests that it is also interested in the effects of the tests on minorities ... (tape turned) ... from this particular context and that was done by the ETS itself. So this information is extremely tentative. What information we do have suggests that the problem is even bigger for selected ethnic groups than it is for women.

Nonetheless, I'd like to caution you that the patterns of over- and underprediction by ethnic groups appear to advantage, not disadvantage, the major groups that are doing poorly on the tests. In other words, although some groups do not do well, on average, on these tests, they do still worse, on

average, in college classes than the tests would predict. I say this not because it's clear that this is true, but I want to caution you against assuming the opposite, which has been sometimes the tenor of these discussions, and the assumption that removal of the tests is going to automatically advantage presently disadvantaged groups. I'm not absolutely positive that that's true. It may be true, but the little research that's been published doesn't make that automatically true.

Finally, let me just say a little bit here about what I think is the appropriate policy responses to what I have just said, and this is, of course, now my political judgment, and you will of course heavily discount it.

SENATOR HUGHES: You haven't said it yet.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: I know. I meant you should discount it. I didn't mean that you would.

As the SATs, even when used with high school grades, produce biased predictions when used in by-the-numbers decisions, I believe it is inappropriate to make them a part of legally mandated admissions qualifications. Thus, I would define UC and CSU eligibility qualifications by high school class rank on a mandated set of courses alone and would not use standardized tests in making any definition about UC or CSU eligibility.

I would note in passing that one could not define admissions standards by grades alone -- by grades as opposed to rank in the absence of some kind of standardized test because that would then lead to rampant grade inflation throughout the state's high schools. They would then compete with one another as to who could give the highest grades. If you did it by rank order, however, there is no basis for competition.

SENATOR HUGHES: All right. Have you had a chance -- Professor, I hate to interrupt you; I mean I'm just bursting with the desire to hear your

answer to this -- have you had a chance to look at my SCA 7? Is it as crazy as--

PROFESSOR LEONARD: No. I have not looked at the bill.

SENATOR HUGHES: Well, I want you to look at it. I think it runs along the lines of what you just expressed.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: I know that this is the direction that you were moving and that was why I wanted to comment on it. I would like to say just one further thing along this though. Despite the fact that I think that eliminating the tests as a criterion of eligibility would be highly desirable, I do think that admissions officers at highly competitive institutions of higher education in the state need to be able to still use standardized tests in making their admit decisions. Otherwise, I fear -- and we at Berkeley have some very concrete experience about this -- I fear that otherwise we'll end up with students who are inadequately prepared put in a highly competitive environment in which they're likely to fail. And this is actually a serious disadvantage or disservice to these students. You know, the institution can cope with students failing out. I think the young people have a great deal of difficulty in coping with failing out.

So the fair use of standardized tests requires that they be used with the freedom to use qualitative indicators of likely college success and to make adjustments for their known limitations. Such flexibility is likely to be difficult if the tests are either legally required -- as, in effect, they have been up to now -- or legally prohibited. So my research leads me to support where I think you have in fact been going, which is to try to pull these out of the eligibility. But I do ask that we still be allowed to use them on the margins at the highly competitive institutions.

SENATOR HUGHES: I certainly understand that. I appreciate your testimony. I would like for you to take a very close look at SCA 7 and its intent. And as I said before CPEC the other day, it's not a hard and fixed number, my 12.5 percent. It's a concept in progress of exploration. And from what your faculty has talked about, the 4 percent, which is substantially low, which is a very low goal for, I think, the University of California to be striving for, and look at my 12.5 -- your tenured professors say 6 percent and another tenured professor group says 8 percent -- and maybe somewhere near the middle we can reach where students really are.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: Well, I think the issue of the percentage is a resource question. We in the university will be delighted to teach as many students as the State Legislature is prepared to finance. So I think it's a matter of picking a number which gives us the number of students that are consistent with the state's financial capabilities.

SENATOR HUGHES: Yes. But I want it to be consistent with the aspirational goals that I think our population should be aspiring to because of the fact that we're no longer recognized in K-12 education to where we were recognized some 30 years ago. But still, the University of California is recognized worldwide as being the greatest research institution in the world.

So as you continue your research efforts, I hope your research will help us move into the direction that we are attempting to move in as we have to accommodate the population that we have here in this state. That continues to grow despite our earthquakes, despite our floods, and because of the fact that our economy is moving and moving fast. And so all of these things have to be balanced. People have to feel that they want to come to our state despite our physical handicaps, but because we have a great population pool and we have great natural resources. Now we don't have a water problem

anymore, and we certainly don't have a brain problem because we've got lots of brains here that are fertile, that need to be further developed.

PROFESSOR LEONARD: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you. Now, also from the Department of Sociology, Michael Hout.

PROFESSOR MICHAEL HOUT: Thank you very much for the chance to come and testify today. As I was invited to present today, it was because of a book that six of us in the Department of Sociology published last year -- well, actually it was in 1996 -- called, *Inequality by Design: Cracking the Bell Curve Myth*, in which we take on this whole industry of testing and the presumptions around it. And I think the testimony we've already heard today pretty much summarizes the case we make in the book.

We've heard today a wide variety of individuals from around the state talk about a variety of different outcomes. I'm particularly referring to the two panels that came and talked about the secondary school experience. First, the students who were on at around 2:00 and then the principals who came later.

One of the points we make in *Inequality by Design* is that students differ a lot in how they perform on tests because they differ a lot in their school experiences. They go to high schools that are vastly different. And we've heard that underscored, starred, asterisked, put in italics and bold type when those four students came up and talked and then the four principals came up and talked. The contrast between L.A. and Whittier is stunning beyond words. And although we based our book on a nationally representative sample of 13,000 students, we might have based it on those couple of case studies and come to the same conclusion.

And so I want to underscore that for you today, is that we've been talking a lot about biases in the tests, but in fact, we've got a huge bias built in to the secondary education system in this state, and holding any testing vendor to the standard of eliminating all of those biases that we have worked so hard to build in to the secondary school system is perhaps holding them to an untenable standard. Which doesn't mean that we should take their word for everything, but it's a caveat I wanted to throw on the table based on the conclusions that we came to in our research, and that I feel was underscored in the testimony given today.

Now, I actually came here -- and you'll see in the handout -- to present two additional pieces of information that you might not be thinking about in the course of this. I'm not going to address myself directly to the testing issue specifically, but rather to the issue of the inequalities and inequities in higher education and how they play out in the labor market.

First of all, let's take a step back and think about where this testing mania came from. You know, university admission is just one of many test-based passages in a journey that starts in primary school and goes right on up to the LSATs, MSATs, etc., that people take to get into law school and business school and medical school. Had the expanded tests removed or even reduced the role of social class in educational achievement? No. Although the correlation between a young person's socioeconomic background and her educational credentials was cut in half between 1950 and 1975, the proliferation of testing had nothing to do with it. The key factor was the expansion of public higher education in this country. And not ironically, in fact, not coincidentally, the slow-down in improvement in that regard since 1975 is coincident with the slow-down and the expansion of public higher

education since then. And I give you the references in the handout. I won't bore you with all of our names.

Does that mean we can get away with abandoning testing? I've got one other thing that -- I was ready to jump on this bandwagon, but I'm actually slightly cautious and you'll see in my prepared remarks that I'm cautious on this, because there's another set of results which make me cautious and I hope make you some what cautious. And that is we've got a good thing here. A UC education pays off more than an education from a less selective college or university. I'm reading from page 2 here if you want to look, sort of in the middle of page 2. Alumni of universities where the average SAT score is over 1150 earn higher wages after graduation than the alumni of less selective universities after you adjust for the person's own SAT scores or any other kind of test scores.

And a recent result I've just become aware of from Tom Kane at Harvard shows that this "smart peers" effect, which we report in *Inequality By Design*, is actually the greatest for the people who score the lowest. That is, the boost that people get from their peers or from attending a selective university is greater if they just barely made it in than if they were one of these people who could be admitted under any criterion. More specifically, people who have scores of 1400 and over get almost no boost from going to a selective school. They could go to university of "made-it-up-yesterday," and still do well in the labor market. It's those students who have SAT scores of 900 and below who get the biggest benefit. And Kane's estimate is that they get a benefit of about 8 percent. That is to say, their wages are 8 percent higher attending UC Berkeley or UCLA instead of Sac State, or Stanislaus State, or what have you.

SENATOR HUGHES: Because they carry along with them the prestige and the perception of the institution that they graduate from and it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

PROFESSOR HOUT: This is something that the research can't answer. I'll give you four hypotheticals in the handout and all four are consistent with the data, and we can't say which. It could be the faculty. We might be smarter and teach better than people elsewhere, or because we have lower teaching loads we have more time to devote to the four classes we do teach. We've got better facilities. It might be the teaching is the same everywhere, but having a smart kid to turn to when you didn't understand the lecture might have real pedagogical value that we tend to overlook. Or it might be the brand name that you just pointed to. That is to say, we've got the prestige. The research right now is not able to answer which of those four is--

SENATOR HUGHES: I think it also helps -- and I haven't researched this -- that you have the kind of mix that you have there. The student that hasn't achieved as high academically to get into the institution profits from being in the company of the students who are higher academic achievers, and so you know that these students all get into study groups, and the peer relationships are probably a tremendous influence.

PROFESSOR HOUT: I would hope so, but I don't know of any research that directly hits that nail on the head.

SENATOR HUGHES: I'm sure it does. Connections.

PROFESSOR HOUT: To the extent to which, though, it's a brand name, we might not want to tinker too much.

One additional issue -- and actually, Bob anticipated me bringing this

up. We were on a panel together in Minneapolis back in May and I made this point and I'm going to make it again today, as he predicted. He might not have been able to predict my GPA, but he could predict the fact that I'll make this point. The winning appeal, it seems to me, part of the winning appeal of Proposition 209, was its emphasis on merit and the simple notion many people seem to have that students with high scores deserve UC admission more than students with lower scores. We even heard in some of the testimony today the supposition that some people are qualified to do UC work and other people are not qualified to do UC work.

The research, and we do have decent research on this, shows clearly that wherever students place on these placement tests or achievement tests, or SATs or ACTs, they gain the same amount from a year spent at a selective university. That is to say, they might -- at the end of the year, the kid who scored higher is still "ahead" of the student who did not score as high. But the change in their score from year one to year two is equal. So the sense of the education of UC Berkeley is wasted on someone who has an SAT in the neighborhood of 800 or 900 is false. These young men and women learn as much during that period at UC as do other students.

And so what I would suggest is that we move out of this language and try -- you know, how do you educate the electorate? I don't know -- but that at least among ourselves we get away from the narrow view that we should give the education to those who deserve it, or that it is somehow a reward, to viewing it more as a resource. That it is something that all of California's young people could benefit from and that we make sure we make the most fair and equitable decisions when we make these admission decisions and not completely give ourselves over to formulas and so on. This, of course, forms the new, somewhat cumbersome Berkeley admissions process, but at least

we're making the attempts here to take into account the potential that people who don't score at the top have for gaining from what we have to offer.

SENATOR HUGHES: Thank you.

Our final presenter is Joe Jaramillo, the staff attorney for MALDEF.

MR. JOE JARAMILLO: Thank you, Senator and staff. My name is Joseph Jaramillo and I am a staff attorney with the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF). I'm also speaking on behalf of the Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights of the San Francisco Bay Area. Both groups are civil rights organizations dedicated to the protection and promotion of the civil rights of underrepresented minorities. And MALDEF, of course, has a particular emphasis on Latinos in the United States.

The use of standardized testing in university admissions continues to present a persistent barrier to the access to higher education for underrepresented minorities. In my testimony I would like to highlight particular practices of the University of California and the California State University and then offer suggestions as to how those public institutions can better fulfill their duty of distributing this public resource of higher education in a more fair and equitable way.

I would first like to talk about eligibility. And as we've heard earlier today in prior testimony, we know that both the University of California and CSU utilize standardized test scores for a certain percentage of their applicants in determining just who is eligible to attend individual campuses within those systems. For the University of California, if you have a GPA between a 2.82 and a 3.29, you must score the requisite SAT or ACT score on a sliding scale index. And for CSU, if you have a GPA between 2.0 and 3.0, you must do the same.

It is the position of MALDEF and the Lawyer's Committee that the use of standardized test scores at this stage of admission is entirely inappropriate for several reasons. First, we have to go back to that document called the "California Master Plan for Higher Education. And what that document says, and what both UC and CSU have agreed to do, is to select the top percentage of public high school graduates in the state. The UC, 12.5 percent, and CSU, the top one-third. It does not say anything about utilizing standardized test scores. And it would seem logical that the way to select the top public high school graduates is precisely as Dr. Leonard and others have stated: you select in the class rank order. That's how we know who are the top public high school graduates.

The use of standardized test scores by the very terms of the Master Plan do not belong in the eligibility determination process. Now, that doesn't mean they don't belong at admission to an individual campus and we can still require that applicants must take the SAT I or the ACT, but they do not belong in the eligibility stage. And there are several other reasons and they get back to points that have been made by other testifiers today. I mean, even if test scores were somehow related to the Master Plan's goals, their use is inappropriate based on principles suggested by the testmakers themselves.

Testmakers caution against using test scores as absolute cutoff points below which no applicants will be admitted. And this goes hand-in-hand with the statistical and psychometric principle that you should not make distinctions between two applicants who have statistically insignificant differences in their test scores. Yet that is exactly what the UC and CSU do when they create the sliding scale index. For example, if you have a UC applicant with a 2.94 GPA, they must score 1400 on the SAT I in order to be eligible. This index point excludes the applicant with the very same GPA who

scores 10 or 20 points less on the SAT, even though statistically they're indistinguishable in terms of the numbers, if you want to go by the numbers. So even under the testmakers' own principles, this use of a sliding scale index with cutoff points at each level of GPA is inappropriate.

Finally, the equity concerns at the eligibility stage are very compelling. We know that SAT I scores correlate more with parental income than with the probability of success during the freshman year in college. A study of the 1995 profiles of SAT scores by income demonstrated that the SAT scores increased consistently with parental income across the nation. Contrast that with the recent study of the SAT's ability to predict freshmen grades which showed the correlation range between .32 and .36, meaning that, at best, the SAT explained only about 11 percent of the variation in first-year grades among test-takers.

We can see that what the SAT is really doing, at least at the eligibility stage, is it's predicting -- it's more an indicator of past economic success than future academic success. For these reasons we believe that standardized test scores have no place in determining eligibility to UC or CSU, and that is a definite change that must be made. I haven't looked at SCA 7 recently, but if that's part of SCA 7 then that will go a long way in getting our support towards the bill.

One more point in terms of eligibility -- and I think it's been alluded to by several prior testifiers -- there are these SAT II achievement tests that are also required to be taken, yet you don't need to score at a certain level like you do with the SAT I. So at least in terms of eligibility, as one commentator has noted, SAT II achievement tests are little more than a formality. It's just a hoop you have to jump through in order to be eligible, at least at the University of California. CSU doesn't require that.

The California Postsecondary Commission reports that elimination of the SAT II requirement would increase the percentage of UC eligible public high school graduates across the board of all ethnicities. Thus, we believe that eliminating the SAT II requirement would be highly favorable and recommendable to the University of California and its eligibility stage.

I want to turn to individual campus admissions. Actually, let me backtrack -- one more point as to eligibility -- and I want to rebut, or at least clarify something that was stated by UC Professor Keith Widaman earlier. He made the statement that if we eliminated the SAT from eligibility, that would actually have little or no effect on minority eligibility. I think there's a middle ground. He may be right -- and I haven't looked closely at his rationale and study of that issue -- but there is a middle ground between the current system which takes into account SAT for a limited percentage of the applicants and a system that eliminates it across the board, and that is precisely what I suggested. You eliminate the consideration of the score so that those applicants between 2.82 and 3.29 do not have to fall within a sliding scale, but you still require that all applicants must take SAT I.

So that is going to, by definition, raise the cut-off GPA, but it's not going to raise it as high as eliminating the requirement that you have to -- eliminate the requirement that you have to take the SAT. In other words, if you say, "Nobody has to take the SAT," then that cut-off point is estimated to jump to 3.65. But if you say, "Yes, you have to take the SAT, but we don't consider your SAT score at the eligibility stage," that cut-off point is going to be lower than 3.3 because we know already that if you have a 3.3 or above, it doesn't matter what your SAT score is. And that is something that Keith Widaman failed to mention, or has not studied, and I think it should be studied.

In terms of individual campus admissions, I am heartened by the efforts of UC Berkeley and I think it is the right approach to take. We definitely have to move towards recognizing diverse characteristics and multiple intelligences that are offered by applicants. Of course, each campus should follow the principles that have been discussed already, disregarding insignificant distinctions in test scores and not setting cut-off points. Beyond that, each campus should examine closely the limitations of the test itself. SAT I only measures a narrow, multiple choice version of verbal and math ability. It does not measure a whole set of other desirable characteristics: creative thinking, discipline, emotional intelligence, commitment, drive to succeed, reliability, teamwork, and communication skills. Thus, overemphasis of standardized test scores may result in screening out applicants who can contribute valuable and unique skills.

In conclusion, I would like to recommend that this committee pursue -- and I've seen it in Senator Hughes' Standardized Testing Act of 1998 Fact Sheet -- but pursue a legislative measure that would attempt to screen out standardized tests that have the types of biases that we have seen explained by Dr. Leonard as to gender, and that we at least have some indication that exist among -- or at least with respect to certain ethnic groups.

And I would like to recommend that this committee pressure the UC and CSU to drop their use of standardized test scores at the eligibility stage, and drop the use of the SAT II requirement at the eligibility stage, and do all it can to ensure that individual campuses take measures to minimize the reliance on standardized test scores, given all of the defects that we have heard with respect to language ability, under-prediction of women performance, insignificant distinctions between test scores, etc.

And finally, I would like to recommend that this committee take all action it can to pursue with some individual campuses the possibility of banding test scores so that those statistically insignificant differences will be viewed as a single range, and so that one applicant with 20 points more on the SAT will not be admitted over an applicant with 20 points less, all other things being equal.

And finally I think Bob Schaeffer's recommendation of following the lead of colleges such as Bates, in making the SAT optional, is something that does not necessarily have to be pursued systemwide, but can at least be experimented with on an individual campus basis. And that is something that this committee might want to pursue or pressure our public university systems to experiment with.

Thank you very much.

SENATOR HUGHES: I want to thank all of you for your patience, your time, your thoughts and your suggestions, and we'll work very hard to see what is feasible to try to put in the statute. And of course, I can do none of this without your help, your suggestions and your patience.

And I thank the people in the audience for having such patience to sit here this long. Thank you so very much. And this is to be continued.

And I want to publicly thank my staff who did such a fantastic job. They are really very representative of the University of California and of the State University system, and also of the independent college system. So they are truly products of the systems that we have created.

Meeting adjourned.

--oo0oo--

955-S

Additional copies of this publication may be purchased for $5.25 per copy (includes shipping and handling), **plus current California sales tax.**

Senate Publications
1020 N Street, Room B-53
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 327-2155

Make checks payable to SENATE RULES COMMITTEE.
Please include Senate Publication Number 955-S when ordering.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE